

# ANALYSIS OF SINGULARITIES OF AREA MINIMIZING CURRENTS: A UNIFORM HEIGHT BOUND, ESTIMATES AWAY FROM BRANCH POINTS OF RAPID DECAY, AND UNIQUENESS OF TANGENT CONES

BRIAN KRUMMEL & NESHAN WICKRAMASEKERA

ABSTRACT. This work, together with [KrumWic-a] and [KrumWic-c], forms a series of articles devoted to an analysis of interior singularities of locally area minimizing  $n$ -dimensional rectifiable currents  $T$  of codimension  $\geq 2$ , including a study of uniqueness of tangent cones and asymptotic behaviour of  $T$  at typical (i.e.  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e.) singular points, and the structure of the singular set of  $T$ . In the present article we establish (in Section 2) a new height estimate for  $T$ , which says that in a cylinder in the ambient space, the pointwise distance of  $T$  to a union of non-intersecting planes is bounded from above, in the interior, *linearly* by the  $L^2$  height excess of  $T$  relative to the same union of planes, whenever appropriate smallness-of-excess conditions are satisfied. We use this estimate and techniques inspired by the works [Sim93], [Wic14], [KrumWic17] to establish (in Sections 3 and 4) a decay estimate for  $T$  whenever, among other requirements,  $T$  is significantly closer to a union of planes meeting along an  $(n-2)$ -dimensional subspace than to any single plane. Combined with [KrumWic-a, Theorem 1.1], this decay estimate implies (in Section 5) two main results: (a)  $T$  has a unique tangent cone at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. point, and (b) the set of singular points of  $T$  where  $T$ , upon scaling, does not decay *rapidly* to a plane is countably  $(n-2)$ -rectifiable. In particular, concerning *branch points* of  $T$ , the work here and in [KrumWic-a] establishes the fact that rapid decay to a unique tangent plane is the generic behaviour, in the sense that at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. branch point,  $T$  decays to a unique tangent plane and has *planar frequency* (or the order of contact with the tangent plane) bounded below by  $1 + \alpha$  for some fixed  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n$ ,  $m$  and a mass upper bound for  $T$ ; the planar frequency exists, is uniquely defined and is finite by the approximate monotonicity of the (intrinsic) planar frequency function introduced in [KrumWic-a].

## CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Bounding the distance of an area minimizing current to a union of non-intersecting affine planes linearly in terms of its height excess relative to the same planes	6
2.1.	Notation and preliminaries	6
2.2.	Statements of the main estimates	9
2.3.	$L^\infty$ -distance estimate in terms of tilt excess relative to a plane	10
2.4.	$L^\infty$ -distance estimate in terms of height excess relative to parallel planes	16
2.5.	$L^\infty$ -distance estimate in terms of height excess relative to disjoint, not-necessarily-parallel planes	21
3.	Estimates for area minimizing currents significantly closer to a union of planes meeting along an $(n-2)$ -dimensional subspace than to any single plane	29
3.1.	Notation and statement of graphical representation results	29
3.2.	Proofs of the graphical representation results	34

3.3.	Initial a priori estimates	48
3.4.	A priori estimates for area-minimizers close to a plane	55
3.5.	A priori estimates for area-minimizers not close to a plane	63
4.	Fine blow-ups and decay of fine excess	67
4.1.	Preliminaries, fine blow up class and notation	67
4.2.	Main estimates for fine blow-ups	74
4.3.	Classification of homogeneous degree 1 fine blow-ups	77
4.4.	Asymptotic decay of fine blow-ups	80
4.5.	Decay of fine excess of area minimizing currents	94
5.	$\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$ a.e. uniqueness of tangent cones and $(n-2)$ -rectifiability of the set of singularities where rapid decay to a plane fails	102
	References	109

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This is the second part of our study of interior singularities of  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable currents in an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  for  $m \geq 2$ . In this introduction we shall focus on the results established in the present article and their dependence on the first part [KrumWic-a] of the work, while describing the broader context only briefly. We refer the reader to the introduction to [KrumWic-a] for a more detailed account of our overall approach including the main new ideas and some historical context of the problem.

It is well known that when the codimension  $m \geq 2$ , unlike when  $m = 1$ , a locally area minimizing rectifiable current  $T$  can have (interior) branch point singularities, i.e. non immersed points of  $\text{spt } T \setminus \text{spt } \partial T$  at which one tangent cone to  $T$  is supported on a plane. Non-branch-point singularities of an area minimizer can be characterized as those points where every tangent cone is translation invariant along a linear subspace of dimension at most  $n-2$ . By using this tangent cone criterion to bound the size of the set of non-branch-point singularities, and by developing a number of pioneering fundamental ideas to bound the size of the branch points separately, Almgren in [Alm83] established that the Hausdorff dimension of the singular set of  $T$  is  $\leq n-2$ . (See also [DelSpa14], [DelSpa16-I], [DelSpa16-II]). This is the sharp general Hausdorff dimension upper bound on the singular set.

Apart from the question of the size of the singular set, central in the study of singularities are the questions of uniqueness of tangent cones at singular points, asymptotic nature of the current on approach to singular points and the local structure of the singular set. While these questions for area minimizers of dimension  $n = 2$  have long been settled ([Whi83], [Cha88], [MicWhi95]), little has been known in these directions when  $n \geq 3$ . Our work is aimed at addressing these questions for general  $n$  (while, as it turns out, not relying on the size bound on the singular set—in fact while providing, as a by product, a more efficient proof of the dimension bound than that of [Alm83]). A key difference in higher dimensions is that singular points need not be isolated.

The first step in our approach is to establish decay estimates for  $T$  at typical (i.e.  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e.) singular points, which we complete in the present article building on the work in [KrumWic-a]. These estimates imply, in particular, uniqueness of tangent cones to  $T$  at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. point. They also provide the basis for obtaining local structural properties of the singular set, which we establish

here (in Theorem 1.1) and in [KrumWic-c], as well as the basis for establishing the existence, at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. branch point, of a unique higher order expansion for the current ([KrumWic-c]). The key advantage of this way of proceeding is that once the decay estimates are in place, branch points can be analysed based on the rate of decay towards the (unique) tangent plane, by constructing a single, sufficiently regular center manifold that locally contains all branch points (of fixed density) where the decay (to the tangent plane) is quadratic or faster in scale, and by analysing any other branch points more simply without the need for a center manifold. As pointed out in [KrumWic-c] and mentioned above, one also obtains, incidentally, a considerably streamlined proof of the Hausdorff dimension bound on the singular set (for which not all of our decay estimates are necessary, and in particular, no result from the present article is necessary).

We obtain these decay estimates by decomposing the singular set in a way different from the decomposition based on the tangent cone type (namely, as branch points or non branch points) considered in [Alm83]. Specifically, fixing an integer  $q \geq 2$ , we consider the set  $\mathcal{B}_q$  of points where the current upon rescaling converges *rapidly* to a unique multiplicity  $q$  tangent plane, and the complementary set  $\mathcal{S}_q = \text{sing}_q T \setminus \mathcal{B}_q$ , where  $\text{sing}_q T$  is the set of points  $Y$  with density  $\Theta(T, Y) = q$ . With the help of a new, intrinsic frequency function introduced in [KrumWic-a], as well as certain basic results from the initial parts of Almgren's work (namely, the associated "linear theory" i.e. the theory of Dirichlet energy minimizing multi-valued functions arising as blow-ups of area minimizing currents converging to a plane, and the strong Lipschitz approximation theorem for area minimizing currents that are weakly close to a plane), it is shown in [KrumWic-a, Theorem 1.1] that  $\mathcal{S}_q$  satisfies a certain locally uniform approximation-by-non-planar-cones property. This property says that for each point  $Z_0 \in \mathcal{S}_q$ , there is a number  $\rho_{Z_0} > 0$  such that for each  $Z \in \mathcal{S}_q \cap \mathbf{B}_{\rho_{Z_0}}(Z_0)$  and each scale  $\sigma \in (0, \rho_{Z_0})$ , there is a non-planar cone  $\mathbf{C}_{Z, \sigma}$  (depending on  $Z$  and  $\sigma$ ) which approximates  $T$  at scale  $\sigma$  *significantly better* than any plane does. More precisely, [KrumWic-a, Theorem 1.1] asserts that for any given  $\beta \in (0, 1/2)$ , there is a number  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q, \beta) \in (0, 1)$  such that if we let  $\mathcal{B}_q = \mathcal{B}_q(\beta)$  be the set of points  $Z \in \text{spt } T$  for which the rescaled current  $\eta_{Z, \rho} \# T$  converges, in the  $L^2$  sense, to a (unique) multiplicity  $q$  tangent plane  $\mathbf{P}_Z$  at a rate  $o(\rho^\alpha)$ , then for every  $Z_0 \in \mathcal{S}_q = \mathcal{S}_q(\beta) \equiv \text{sing}_q T \setminus \mathcal{B}_q(\beta)$  and some  $\rho_{Z_0} > 0$ , the following holds true: for each  $Z \in \mathcal{S}_q \cap \mathbf{B}_{\rho_{Z_0}}(Z_0)$  and each  $\sigma \in (0, \rho_{Z_0})$ , either we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\sigma(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_{Z, \sigma}) d\|T\|(X) \\ & + \sigma^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\sigma/2}(Z) \setminus \{Y : \text{dist}(Y, Z + S(\mathbf{C}_{Z, \sigma})) < \sigma/16\}} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + \text{spt } T) d\|\mathbf{C}_{Z, \sigma}\|(X) \\ & \leq \beta \inf_P \sigma^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\sigma(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + P) d\|T\| \quad (\star) \end{aligned}$$

for some (not necessarily area minimizing and not necessarily unique) cone  $\mathbf{C}_{Z, \sigma}$ , with  $\dim S(\mathbf{C}_{Z, \sigma}) = n - 2$ , made up of (at least two distinct) planes, or we have

$$\{Y : \Theta(T, Y) \geq q\} \cap \mathbf{B}_\sigma(Z) \subset \{Y : \text{dist}(Y, Z + L) \leq \beta\sigma\} \quad (\star\star)$$

for some linear subspace  $L \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  of dimension  $\leq n - 3$ . Here  $S(\mathbf{C}_{Z, \sigma})$  denotes the spine of  $\mathbf{C}_{Z, \sigma}$ , i.e. the maximal dimensional linear subspace along which  $\mathbf{C}_{Z, \sigma}$  is translation invariant.

Of course any non-branch-point singularity with density  $q$  is contained in  $\mathcal{S}_q(\beta)$ . We emphasize that we allow  $\mathcal{S}_q(\beta)$  to also contain branch points, and therein lies the most basic difference between our approach and that of [Alm83]. While it follows more or less immediately from the two conditions  $(\star)$  and  $(\star\star)$  that there is  $\gamma = \gamma(n, m, q, \beta)$  with  $\gamma \rightarrow 0^+$  as  $\beta \rightarrow 0^+$  such that  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2+\gamma}(\mathcal{S}_q(\beta)) = 0$ , it is not at all clear from these two conditions alone whether the set of branch points in  $\mathcal{S}_q(\beta)$  cannot have positive  $(n - 2)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. A main purpose of the present paper

is to show that for an appropriate choice of the parameter  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  that depends only on  $n, m$  and  $q$ , this is indeed the case, i.e. to show that there exists  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  such that any branch points that may exist in  $\mathcal{S}_q(\beta)$  must form an  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  null set. In fact our analysis gives much more. It establishes that there exists  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  such that for  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$ -a.e. point  $Z \in \mathcal{S}_q(\beta)$ , the current  $T$  has a unique tangent cone  $\mathbf{C}_Z$  with  $\dim S(\mathbf{C}_Z) = n - 2$ , and moreover that  $\mathcal{S}_q(\beta)$  is  $(n - 2)$ -rectifiable with locally finite  $(n - 2)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. These results, together with the definition of  $\mathcal{B}_q(\beta)$ , then lead to the following theorem, which is the content of Theorem 5.2 and Corollary 5.3 of the present work:

**Theorem 1.1** (Theorem 5.2 and Corollary 5.3). *Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current in an open set  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ , and let  $\text{sing} T$  denote the singular set of  $T$ .*

- (a) *for  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. point  $Z \in \text{spt} T$ , the current  $T$  has a unique tangent cone  $\mathbf{C}_Z$  of the form  $\mathbf{C}_Z = \sum_{j=1}^p q_j \llbracket P_j \rrbracket$  where  $p, q_1, \dots, q_p$  are integers  $\geq 1$ , and  $P_1, \dots, P_p$  are distinct  $n$ -dimensional planes (all depending on  $Z$ ); either  $p = 1$  (i.e.  $\mathbf{C}_Z$  is supported on a single plane) or there is an  $(n - 2)$ -dimensional subspace  $L$  with  $P_i \cap P_j = L$  for every  $i \neq j$ ;*
- (b) *we have that  $\text{sing} T = \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{S}$  where:*
  - (i)  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{S} = \emptyset$ ;
  - (ii)  $\mathcal{S}$  is countably  $(n - 2)$ -rectifiable; and
  - (iii) *for every point  $Z \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $T$  has a unique tangent cone at  $Z$  supported on an  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P_Z$  to which the scaled current about  $Z$  decays rapidly in the following sense: for every compact set  $K \subset U$  there are numbers  $\alpha_K = \alpha(K, T) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C_K = C(K, T) \in (0, \infty)$  such that for every  $Z \in \mathcal{B} \cap K$ , the estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + P_Z) d\|T\|(X) \\ \leq C_K \left(\frac{\rho}{\sigma}\right)^{2\alpha_K} \sigma^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\sigma(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + P_Z) d\|T\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

*holds for some  $\sigma_Z$  (depending on  $Z$ ) and all  $\rho, \sigma$  with  $0 < \rho \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_Z$ .*

Our proof of the above theorem builds on, among other things, techniques from our previous work [Wic14], [KrumWic17] which in turn were inspired by the seminal work [Sim93] of L. Simon. A fundamental new difficulty that needs to be overcome in the present setting however is the lack of a regularity theorem, analogous to Allard's regularity theorem used in [Sim93] or the (inductively used) sheeting theorem established and used in [Wic14], applicable to  $T$ . Explicit well-known examples show that complete regularity (as in decomposition into smooth sheets with curvature estimates, or even decomposition into locally Lipschitz graphs) is in fact false for area minimizers of codimension  $\geq 2$  lying close to a plane. What is needed however is not such complete regularity, but to be able to argue that the current separates as a sum of disjoint (possibly still singular) pieces whenever its  $L^2$  distance to a union of disjoint planes (i.e. fine-excess) is significantly smaller than its  $L^2$  distance to any single plane (i.e. optimal coarse excess). This separation property indeed holds for area minimizers, and is a direct consequence of a new height bound (Theorem 1.2 below) we here establish. This estimate says that whenever  $\mathbf{P}$  is a sum of planes with support consisting of planes that are disjoint in a cylinder, subject to appropriate small-excess and mass assumptions on  $T$  and a measure of disjointness of the planes making up  $\mathbf{P}$  (condition 1.1 below), the pointwise distance of  $T$  to  $\text{spt} \mathbf{P}$  in a smaller cylinder is bounded from above *linearly* by a constant times the  $L^2$ -height excess of  $T$  relative to  $\text{spt} \mathbf{P}$ . (It is a well known, easy consequence of the monotonicity formula that such a bound holds in terms of a certain sublinear expression in height excess of  $T$  relative to  $\mathbf{P}$ , but this weaker version is inadequate for our purposes). This estimate is analogous to

the well-known interior upper bound on the supremum of a solution to a uniformly elliptic equation with bounded coefficients in terms of the  $L^2$  norm of the solution.

**Theorem 1.2** (Theorem 2.15). *For all integers  $q, s, p \geq 1$  with  $p \leq s$  and all  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $\kappa \in (0, \infty)$ , there exists  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(n, m, q, s, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $\mathbf{P} = \sum_{i=1}^p s_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket$  for  $n$ -dimensional planes  $P_i$  with orientation  $\vec{P}_i$ , and integers  $s_i \geq 1$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^p s_i = s$ , and if  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in the cylinder  $\mathbf{C}_1(0) = B_1^n(0) \times \mathbb{R}^m$  such that, writing  $P_0 = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_1(0) &= 0, \quad \pi_{\#} T = q \llbracket B_1^n(0) \rrbracket, \\ \frac{1}{2\omega_n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}_0|^2 d\|T\| &< \varepsilon_0^2, \quad \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\vec{P}_i - \vec{P}_0| < \varepsilon_0, \end{aligned}$$

and either  $p = 1$  or  $p > 1$  and

$$(1.1) \quad |\vec{P}_i - \vec{P}_j| \leq \kappa \inf_{X \in P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_j)$$

for each  $1 \leq i < j \leq p$ , then

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X)$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, s, \kappa, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

If  $p = 1$  (i.e. when  $\mathbf{P}$  consists of a single plane), this is a well-known result due to Allard ([All72]) and in that case it holds for any stationary intergral varifold in place of  $T$ . Our proof of the above theorem for  $p \geq 2$  builds on the case  $p = 1$  and relies on a uniform interior  $C^{0,\alpha}$  estimate for Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued functions due to [Alm83].

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 is devoted to proving Theorem 1.2. In Section 3, using Theorem 1.2 among other things, various a priori estimates analogous to those in [Sim93], [Wic14] are established for an area minimizing current  $T$ . These estimates are valid whenever  $T$  satisfies, for an appropriate choice of  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q)$ , condition  $(\star)$  with  $\sigma = 1$ ,  $Z = 0$  and with  $\mathbf{C}_{Z,\sigma}$  equal to a some cone  $\mathbf{C}$  made up of a union of planes and having  $\dim S(\mathbf{C}) = n - 2$ , and additionally, whenever  $T$  satisfies a certain no-large-gaps hypothesis on the singular set as in [Sim93]. The corresponding estimates in [Sim93] are valid for stationary varifolds not necessarily satisfying an area minimizing condition but required to belonging to a multiplicity 1 class; additionally, in place of condition  $(\star)$ , in [Sim93] the varifold is assumed to have small excess relative to a cylindrical cone  $\mathbf{C}$  that lies close to a fixed (singular) cylindrical cone  $\mathbf{C}_0$  in the class, and the constants in the estimates are allowed to depend on  $\mathbf{C}_0$  (in addition to  $n$ ,  $m$  and a mass bound). In our setting, it is important that the constants depend only on  $n$ ,  $m$  and  $q$  and in particular are independent of  $\mathbf{C}$ . In Section 4 the estimates in Section 3 in conjunction with adaptations of ideas from [KrumWic17] are used to establish a decay estimate for the fine blow-ups of sequences  $(T_j)$  of area minimizing currents satisfying  $(\star)$  with  $\beta = \beta_j \rightarrow 0^+$  and with  $\sigma = 1$ ,  $Z = 0$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{Z,\sigma}$  equal to some cone  $\mathbf{C}_j$  made up of a union of planes and having  $\dim S(\mathbf{C}_j) = n - 2$ , as well as satisfying the no-large-gaps condition with the gap size tending to zero. This blow-up analysis then leads to an excess decay estimate (Theorem 4.15) for an area minimizing current  $T$  satisfying, among other things, condition  $(\star)$  for an appropriate fixed  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and with  $\sigma = 1$ ,  $Z = 0$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{Z,\sigma}$  equal to a some cone  $\mathbf{C}$  made up of a union of planes and having  $\dim S(\mathbf{C}) = n - 2$ . Finally, by combining [KrumWic-a, Theorem 1.1] with this decay estimate, in Section 5 we obtain  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. uniqueness of tangent cones to  $T$  and  $(n - 2)$ -rectifiability of  $\mathcal{S}_q(\beta)$ , arguing exactly as in [Sim93, Section 5].

2. BOUNDING THE DISTANCE OF AN AREA MINIMIZING CURRENT TO A UNION OF  
NON-INTERSECTING AFFINE PLANES LINEARLY IN TERMS OF ITS HEIGHT EXCESS RELATIVE  
TO THE SAME PLANES

**2.1. Notation and preliminaries.** Throughout the paper, we shall adopt the same notation as [KrumWic-a]. See Section 2 of [KrumWic-a] for a discussion of general notation, as well as an overview of locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents and Dirichlet energy minimizing multi-valued functions.

Let  $n, m$  be integers  $\geq 2$ . We shall express each point  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  as  $X = (x, y)$  where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . For each  $X_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $\rho > 0$  we let

$$\mathbf{B}_\rho(X_0) = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : |X - X_0| < \rho\}.$$

For each  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\rho > 0$  we let

$$\begin{aligned} B_\rho(x_0) &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - x_0| < \rho\}, \\ \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0) &= B_\rho(x_0) \times \mathbb{R}^m. \end{aligned}$$

We shall often write  $P_0 = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ . Throughout we will let  $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow P_0$  denote the orthogonal projection map onto  $P_0$  and  $\pi^\perp : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow P_0^\perp$  denote the orthogonal projection map onto the orthogonal complement  $P_0^\perp$  of  $P_0$ . We shall assume that  $P_0$  is oriented by the  $n$ -vector  $\vec{P}_0 = e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_n$ , where  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{n+m}$  is the standard basis for  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ .

**Definition 2.1.** For integers  $p, q$  with  $1 \leq p \leq q$ , let  $\mathcal{P}_{q,p}$  denote the set of all  $n$ -dimensional rectifiable currents  $\mathbf{P}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  which can be expressed as a sum of parallel planes in the form

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbf{P} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket,$$

where  $q_i \geq 1$  are integers such that  $\sum_{i=1}^p q_i = q$ ,  $P_i = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{a_i\}$  for distinct  $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $P_i$  is oriented by the  $n$ -vector  $\vec{P}_0 = e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_n$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}_q = \bigcup_{p=1}^q \mathcal{P}_{q,p}$ .

**Definition 2.2.** We associate each  $a = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket a_i \rrbracket \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  (where  $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , possibly repeating) with  $\mathbf{P}_a = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket \mathbb{R}^n \times \{a_i\} \rrbracket \in \mathcal{P}_q$ .

**Definition 2.3.** For  $1 < p \leq q$  and  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{q,p}$  as in (2.1), we define

$$\text{sep}(\mathbf{P}) = \min_{i \neq j} |a_i - a_j| \quad \text{width}(\mathbf{P}) = \max_{i \neq j} |a_i - a_j|.$$

If  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{q,1}$ , we define  $\text{sep}(\mathbf{P}) = \infty$  and  $\text{width}(\mathbf{P}) = 0$ .

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $q \geq 1$  be an integer,  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $\rho > 0$ . Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)$  such that  $(\partial T)_\perp \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0) = 0$  and let  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_q$ . The height excess of  $T$  relative to  $\mathbf{P}$  in  $\mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)$  is given by

$$E(T, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)) = \left( \frac{1}{\omega_n \rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\rho > 0$ . Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)$  such that  $(\partial T)_\perp \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0) = 0$  and  $\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T} \text{dist}(X, P_0) < \infty$ . The (oriented) tilt excess  $\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0))$  (of  $T$  relative to  $\llbracket P_0 \rrbracket$ ) is given by

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0))^2 = \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0))}{\omega_n \rho^n} - \frac{\|\pi_\# T\|(\mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0))}{\omega_n \rho^n}.$$

Notice that by the constancy theorem [Sim83, Theorem 26.27]

$$(2.3) \quad \pi_{\#}T = q\llbracket B_{\rho}(x_0) \rrbracket$$

for some integer constant  $q$ . Here  $q$  can be zero, positive in the case that  $\pi_{\#}T$  is oriented by  $\vec{P}_0$ , or negative in the case that  $\pi_{\#}T$  is oriented by  $-\vec{P}_0$ . Often we will assume that  $q \geq 0$  since otherwise we can replace  $T$  with  $-T$ . Assuming  $q \geq 0$ , by [Fed69, 5.3.1]

$$\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0))^2 = \frac{1}{2\omega_n\rho^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}_0|^2 d\|T\|,$$

where  $\vec{T}$  is the orienting  $n$ -vector of  $T$ . Moreover, by (2.2) and (2.3),

$$\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0))^2 = \frac{\|T\|(\mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0))}{\omega_n\rho^n} - q$$

or equivalently,

$$(2.4) \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0)) = (q + \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0))^2)\omega_n\rho^n.$$

As a straightforward consequence of the monotonicity formula, we can often show that  $q \neq 0$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ ,  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $\rho > 0$ . Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0)$  such that*

$$(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0) = 0, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T} \text{dist}(X, P_0) < \infty, \quad \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0)) < (1 - \gamma)^n.$$

*Then either  $T \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{\gamma\rho}(x_0) = 0$  or there exists a nonzero integer  $q$  such that (2.3) holds true.*

*Proof.* See [KrumWic-a, Lemma 2.7]. □

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\rho > 0$ . Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0)$  such that for some integer  $q \geq 0$*

$$(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0) = 0, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T} \text{dist}(X, P_0) < \infty, \quad \pi_{\#}T = q\llbracket B_{\rho}(x_0) \rrbracket, \quad \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0)) < 1.$$

*Suppose that for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  there are  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents  $T_i$  of  $\mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0)$  such that*

$$(\partial T_i) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0) = 0 \text{ for all } i, \quad T = \sum_{i=1}^N T_i, \quad \|T\| = \sum_{i=1}^N \|T_i\|.$$

*Then for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  there exist an integer  $q_i \geq 0$  such that  $\pi_{\#}T_i = q_i\llbracket B_{\rho}(x_0) \rrbracket$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^N q_i = q$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . By the constancy theorem, there exist an integer  $q_i$  such that  $\pi_{\#}T_i = q_i\llbracket B_{\rho}(x_0) \rrbracket$ . We have that  $q_i \geq 0$  since

$$-q_i \leq \frac{\|T_i\|(\mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0))}{\omega_n\rho^n} - q_i = \frac{1}{2\omega_n\rho^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\rho}(x_0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}_0|^2 d\|T_i\| \leq \frac{1}{2\omega_n\rho^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}_0|^2 d\|T\| < 1,$$

where  $\vec{T}$  is the orientation  $n$ -vector of  $T$  and  $\vec{T}|_{\text{spt } T_i}$  orients  $T_i$ . Clearly  $\sum_{i=1}^N q_i = q$ . □

The following elementary ‘‘coarse’’ upper bound for distance will be used in the proof of our main distance estimates.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $q \geq 1$  be an integer and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ . If  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_q$  and  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  with  $(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_1(0) = 0$  such that*

$$\frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) < \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{2}\right)^{n+2},$$

then

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \leq 2 \left( \frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) \right)^{\frac{1}{n+2}}.$$

*Proof.* See [KrumWic-a, Lemma 2.6] (with  $K = \text{spt } \mathbf{P}$ ).  $\square$

The following Lipschitz and harmonic approximation results due to Almgren ([Alm83]) will play an important role in our distance estimates.

**Theorem 2.9** (Almgren's strong approximation theorem). *For each  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, m, q, \gamma) > 0$  such that the following holds true. Let  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\rho > 0$ . Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)$  such that*

$$(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0) = 0, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt}} \text{dist}(X, P_0) < \infty, \quad \pi_{\#} T = q \llbracket B_\rho(x_0) \rrbracket, \quad \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)) < \varepsilon,$$

where  $\pi$  is the orthogonal projection map onto  $P_0$ . Then there exists a Lipschitz  $q$ -valued function  $u : B_{\gamma\rho}(x_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and a closed set  $K \subset B_\rho(x_0)$  such that

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Lip } u &\leq C\mathcal{E}^\alpha, \quad T \llcorner (K \times \mathbb{R}^m) = (\text{graph } u) \llcorner (K \times \mathbb{R}^m), \\ \mathcal{L}^n(B_{\gamma\rho}(x_0) \setminus K) + \|T\|((B_{\gamma\rho}(x_0) \setminus K) \times \mathbb{R}^m) &\leq C\mathcal{E}^{2+\alpha}\rho^n, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad \left| \omega_n(\sigma\rho)^n \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\sigma\rho}(x_0)) - \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_{\sigma\rho}(x_0)} |Du|^2 \right| \leq C\mathcal{E}^{2+\alpha}\rho^n$$

for all  $0 < \sigma \leq \gamma$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  are constants.

*Proof.* See [Alm83, Corollary 3.29] or [DelSpa14, Theorem 2.4].  $\square$

**Theorem 2.10** (Harmonic approximation theorem). *For every  $\eta > 0$  and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, m, q, \gamma, \eta) > 0$  such that the following holds true. Let  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\rho > 0$ . Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)$  such that*

$$(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0) = 0, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt}} \text{dist}(X, P_0) < \infty, \quad \pi_{\#} T = q \llbracket B_\rho(x_0) \rrbracket, \quad \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)) < \varepsilon,$$

where  $\pi$  is the orthogonal projection map onto  $P_0$ . Let  $u : B_{\gamma\rho}(x_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  be the Lipschitz approximation of  $T$  as in Theorem 2.9. Then there exists a Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued function  $w : B_{\gamma\rho}(x_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  such that

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{1}{\rho^{n+2}} \int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(x_0)} \mathcal{G}(u, w)^2 + \frac{1}{\rho^n} \int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(x_0)} (|Du| - |Dw|)^2 \leq \eta\mathcal{E}^2.$$

*Proof.* This is [Alm83, Theorem 3.33] or [DelSpa14, Theorem 2.6] with obvious modifications.  $\square$

We will also need the following estimate that bounds (oriented) tilt excess from above by the height excess.



**Lemma 2.11.** *Let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ ,  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $\rho > 0$ . If  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)$  such that*

$$(\partial T)_\# \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0) = 0, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)} \text{dist}(X, P_0) \leq 1,$$

then

$$\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\gamma\rho}(x_0)) \leq C \left( \frac{1}{\rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_0) d\|T\|(X) \right)^{1/2}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* This is [KrumWic-a, Lemma 2.8] which is essentially the same as [HarSim79, Lemma 3.2].  $\square$

**2.2. Statements of the main estimates.** The conclusion of Lemma 2.8 is too coarse to use in practice. More useful would be a bound, for the  $L^\infty$ -distance of  $T$  to a sum of planes  $\mathbf{P}$ , that is linear in the height excess of  $T$  with respect to  $\mathbf{P}$ , or linear in the tilt excess of  $T$  relative to  $P_0$ . We establish both of these in our main results Theorem 2.12 and Theorem 2.13.

**Theorem 2.12.** *For each integer  $q \geq 1$  and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  such that*

$$(2.8) \quad (\partial T)_\# \mathbf{C}_1(0) = 0, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T} \text{dist}(X, P_0) < \infty, \quad \pi_\# T = q\llbracket B_1(0) \rrbracket, \quad \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)) < \varepsilon_0,$$

then there exists  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_q$  such that

$$(2.9) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \leq C \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)),$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant.

**Theorem 2.13.** *For all integers  $q, s \geq 1$  and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(n, m, q, s, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$ ,  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_s$  and if*

$$(2.10) \quad (\partial T)_\# \mathbf{C}_1(0) = 0, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T} \text{dist}(X, P_0) < \infty, \quad \pi_\# T = q\llbracket B_1(0) \rrbracket, \quad \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)) < \varepsilon_0,$$

then

$$(2.11) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X),$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, s, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant.

Theorem 2.13 can be used to deduce a more general estimate (Theorem 2.15 below) in which the planes making up  $\mathbf{P}$  are non intersecting but not necessarily parallel to  $P_0$ . We introduce the following notation first:

**Definition 2.14.** For positive integers  $1 \leq p \leq s$ ,  $\Pi_{s,p}$  denote the set of all  $n$ -dimensional rectifiable currents  $\mathbf{P}$  which can be expressed as a sum of planes

$$(2.12) \quad \mathbf{P} = \sum_{i=1}^p s_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket,$$

where  $p \geq 1$  and  $s_i \geq 1$  are integers such that  $\sum_{i=1}^p s_i = s$  and  $P_i$  are distinct  $n$ -dimensional planes of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  oriented by  $n$ -vectors  $\vec{P}_i$ . We let  $\Pi_s = \bigcup_{p=1}^s \Pi_{s,p}$ .

**Theorem 2.15.** *For all integers  $q \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq p \leq s$  and all  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $\kappa \in (0, \infty)$ , there exists  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(n, m, q, s, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $\mathbf{P} \in \Pi_{s,p}$  (as in (2.12)) and  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  such that*

$$(2.13) \quad (\partial T)_\perp \mathbf{C}_1(0) = 0, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T} \text{dist}(X, P_0) < \infty, \quad \pi_\# T = q \llbracket B_1(0) \rrbracket,$$

$$\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^2 = \frac{1}{2\omega_n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}_0|^2 d\|T\| < \varepsilon_0^2, \quad \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\vec{P}_i - \vec{P}_0| < \varepsilon_0,$$

and either  $p = 1$  or  $p > 1$  and

$$(2.14) \quad |\vec{P}_i - \vec{P}_j| \leq \kappa \inf_{X \in P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_j)$$

for each  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  with  $i \neq j$ , then

$$(2.15) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X)$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, s, \kappa, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

**2.3.  $L^\infty$ -distance estimate in terms of tilt excess relative to a plane.** In this section we prove Theorem 2.12. The proof is based on a controlled growth estimate for the tilt excess (Lemma 2.16), which follows from a growth estimate for the Dirichlet energy of a Dirichlet energy minimizing multi-valued function, established in [Alm83, Theorem 2.13]. We combine this with a Poincaré type inequality (Lemma 2.17), and iteratively apply both results as long as the tilt excess  $\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_\rho(\xi))$  remains small. At scales where  $\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_\rho(\xi))$  is no longer small, we use the coarse bound given by Lemma 2.8.

**Lemma 2.16** (Controlled growth of tilt excess). *For every  $\theta \in (0, 1/8)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(n, m, q, \theta) \in (0, 1)$  such that the following holds true. Let  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\rho > 0$ . Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)$  such that*

$$(2.16) \quad (\partial T)_\perp \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0) = 0, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T} \text{dist}(X, P_0) < \infty,$$

$$\pi_\# T = q \llbracket B_\rho(x_0) \rrbracket, \quad \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)) < \varepsilon_1.$$

Then

$$(2.17) \quad \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\theta\rho}(x_0)) \leq C\theta^{\mu-1} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0))$$

for some constants  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\mu = \mu(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  (independent of  $\theta$ ).

*Proof.* Without loss of generality assume that  $x_0 = 0$  and  $\rho = 1$ . Let  $\eta = \eta(n, m, q, \theta) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(n, m, q, \theta) > 0$  to be later determined. Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  such that (2.16) holds true. Set  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))$ . Assuming  $\varepsilon_1$  is sufficiently small,  $T$  has a Lipschitz approximation  $u : B_{1/4}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  as in Theorem 2.9 with  $\gamma = 1/4$  and a harmonic approximation  $w : B_{1/4}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  as in Theorems 2.10 with  $\gamma = 1/4$ . By [Alm83, Theorem 2.13], there exists  $\mu = \mu(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\theta^{2-n} \int_{B_\theta(0)} |Dw|^2 \leq 4^{n-2+2\mu} \theta^{2\mu} \int_{B_{1/4}(0)} |Dw|^2.$$

Thus by (2.7),

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{-n} \int_{B_\theta(0)} |Du|^2 &\leq 2\theta^{-n} \int_{B_\theta(0)} |Dw|^2 + 2\eta\theta^{-n}\mathcal{E}^2 \\ &\leq 2 \cdot 4^{n-2+2\mu}\theta^{2\mu-2} \int_{B_{1/4}(0)} |Dw|^2 + 2\eta\theta^{-n}\mathcal{E}^2 \\ &\leq 4^{n-1+2\mu}\theta^{2\mu-2} \int_{B_{1/4}(0)} |Du|^2 + 4^{n-1+2\mu}\eta\theta^{2\mu-2}\mathcal{E}^2 + 2\eta\theta^{-n}\mathcal{E}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Choose  $\eta = \eta(n, m, q, \theta) \in (0, 1)$  so that  $(4^{n-1+2\mu} + \theta^{2-n-2\mu})\eta < \omega_n$ . Then provided  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(n, m, q, \theta)$  is sufficiently small

$$\theta^{-n} \int_{B_\theta(0)} |Du|^2 \leq 4^{n-1+2\mu}\theta^{2\mu-2} \int_{B_{1/8}(0)} |Du|^2 + \theta^{2\mu-2}\omega_n\mathcal{E}^2.$$

By (2.6),

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{-n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_\theta(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}_0|^2 d\|T\| &\leq \theta^{-n} \int_{B_\theta(0)} |Du|^2 + C\theta^{-n}\mathcal{E}^{2+\alpha} \\ &\leq C\theta^{2\mu-2} \int_{B_{1/8}(0)} |Du|^2 + \theta^{2\mu-2}\mathcal{E}^2 + C\theta^{-n}\mathcal{E}^{2+\alpha} \\ &\leq C\theta^{2\mu-2}\mathcal{E}^2 + C\theta^{2\mu-2}\mathcal{E}^{2+\alpha} + \theta^{2\mu-2}\mathcal{E}^2 + C\theta^{-n}\mathcal{E}^{2+\alpha} \\ &\leq (3C + 1)\theta^{2\mu-2}\mathcal{E}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  are constants and we assumed  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(n, m, q, \theta)$  is small enough that  $\mathcal{E}^\alpha < \varepsilon_1^\alpha < 1$  and  $\theta^{2-n-2\mu}\mathcal{E}^\alpha < \theta^{2-n-2\mu}\varepsilon_1^\alpha < 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.17** (Poincaré-type inequality). *For each  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon_2(n, m, q, \gamma) > 0$  such that the following holds true. Let  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\rho > 0$ . Suppose that  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)$  such that*

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{aligned} (\partial T)_\perp \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0) &= 0, & \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T} \text{dist}(X, P_0) &< \infty, \\ \pi_\# T &= q\llbracket B_\rho(x_0) \rrbracket, & \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0)) &< \varepsilon_2. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $u : B_{(1+\gamma)\rho/2}(x_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and  $K \subset B_{(1+\gamma)\rho/2}(x_0)$  be as in Theorem 2.9 with  $(1+\gamma)/2$  in place of  $\gamma$ . Then there exists  $a \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  such that

$$(2.19) \quad \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\gamma\rho}(x_0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_a) d\|T\|(X) + \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(x_0)} \mathcal{G}(u, a)^2 \leq C\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0))^2$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ , where  $\mathbf{P}_a \in \mathcal{P}_q$  is the sum of planes associated with  $a$  as in Definition 2.2.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality assume  $x_0 = 0$  and  $\rho = 1$ . Let  $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon_2(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  be a small constant to be later determined. Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  such that (2.18) holds true. Set  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))$ . Let  $u : B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and  $K \subset B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)$  be as in Theorem 2.9 with  $(1+\gamma)/2$  in place of  $\gamma$ . By the Poincaré inequality [DelSpa11, Proposition 2.12], there exists  $a \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  such that

$$(2.20) \quad \int_{B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} \mathcal{G}(u, a)^2 \leq C \int_{B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} |Du|^2$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Let  $\mathbf{P}_a \in \mathcal{P}_q$  be the sums of planes associated with  $a$  as in Definition 2.2. By (2.6),

$$(2.21) \quad \int_{B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} |Du|^2 \leq C(n) \mathcal{E}^2$$

provided  $\varepsilon_2$  is sufficiently small. By (2.5) and the area formula (see (2.29) and (2.28) of [KrumWic-a])

$$(2.22) \quad \int_{K \times \mathbb{R}^m} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_a) d\|T\|(X) \leq 2 \int_{B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} \mathcal{G}(u, a)^2$$

provided  $\varepsilon_2$  is sufficiently small. By (2.22), (2.20), and (2.21),

$$(2.23) \quad \int_{K \times \mathbb{R}^m} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_a) d\|T\|(X) \leq C\mathcal{E}^2,$$

$$(2.24) \quad \int_{B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} \mathcal{G}(u, a)^2 \leq C\mathcal{E}^2$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

Suppose that

$$\text{dist}(Z, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_a) \geq 1 - \gamma$$

for some  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)$ . Then by the monotonicity formula and the fact that  $\|T\|((B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \setminus K) \times \mathbb{R}^m) \leq C\mathcal{E}^{2+\alpha}$  (as in (2.5)),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{K \times \mathbb{R}^m} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_a) d\|T\|(X) &\geq \int_{\mathbf{B}_{(1-\gamma)/2}(Z) \cap (K \times \mathbb{R}^m)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_a) d\|T\|(X) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{2}\right)^2 \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_{(1-\gamma)/2}(Z) \cap (K \times \mathbb{R}^m)) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{2}\right)^2 (\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_{(1-\gamma)/2}(Z)) - C\mathcal{E}^{2+\alpha}) \\ &\geq \omega_n \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{2}\right)^{n+2} - C\mathcal{E}^{2+\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

which, provided  $\varepsilon_2$  is sufficiently small, contradicts (2.23). Therefore

$$(2.25) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_a) \leq 1 - \gamma.$$

By (2.25) and the fact that  $\|T\|((B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \setminus K) \times \mathbb{R}^m) \leq C\mathcal{E}^{2+\alpha}$ ,

$$(2.26) \quad \int_{(B_\gamma(0) \setminus K) \times \mathbb{R}^m} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_a) d\|T\|(X) \leq C\mathcal{E}^{2+\alpha}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . By (2.23), (2.26), and (2.24), we obtain (2.19).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.12.* Let  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  to be later determined. Choose  $\theta = \theta(n, m, q) \in (0, 1/8)$  so that  $C\theta^{\mu/2} < 1$ , where  $\mu$  and  $C$  are as in Lemma 2.16. Suppose that  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  such that (2.8) holds true. Let  $u : B_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and  $K \subset B_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0)$  be the Lipschitz approximation of  $T$  as in Theorem 2.9 with  $x_0 = 0$ ,  $\rho = 1$ , and  $(3+\gamma)/4$  in place of  $\gamma$ . Provided  $\varepsilon_0$  is sufficiently small, by

Lemma 2.17 (with  $(1 + \gamma)/2$  in place of  $\gamma$ ) there exists  $a \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and associated sum of planes  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_q$  as in Definition 2.2 such that

$$(2.27) \quad \int_{\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) + \int_{B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} \mathcal{G}(u, a)^2 \leq C_1 \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^2$$

for some constant  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Notice that if  $\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)) = 0$ , then by (2.27) we must have that

$$\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \subset \text{spt } \mathbf{P}$$

thereby proving the theorem. Hence we may assume that  $\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)) > 0$ .

Let  $i_0 \geq 1$  be the integer such that

$$(2.28) \quad \theta^{i(\mu/2-1)} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)) < \varepsilon_0$$

for all  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, i_0 - 1\}$  and

$$(2.29) \quad \theta^{i_0(\mu/2-1)} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)) \geq \varepsilon_0.$$

Note that by the assumption (2.8), (2.28) holds true for  $i = 0$ . Moreover, since  $\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)) > 0$ , (2.29) holds true for some  $i_0$ . Fix any  $\xi \in B_\gamma(0)$ . We claim that for each  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, i_0\}$

$$(2.30) \quad \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\theta^i(1-\gamma)/2}(\xi)) \leq \left(\frac{2}{1-\gamma}\right)^{n/2} \theta^{i(\mu/2-1)} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)).$$

Notice that when  $i = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{(1-\gamma)/2}(\xi)) &= \frac{1}{2\omega_n((1-\gamma)/2)^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{(1-\gamma)/2}(\xi)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}_0|^2 d\|T\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\omega_n((1-\gamma)/2)^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}_0|^2 d\|T\| = \left(\frac{2}{1-\gamma}\right)^n \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^2, \end{aligned}$$

proving (2.30) with  $i = 0$ . Suppose that for some  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, i_0 - 1\}$  we know that (2.30) holds true. Then by (2.28) and (2.30),

$$(2.31) \quad \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\theta^{i+1}(1-\gamma)/2}(\xi)) \leq \left(\frac{2}{1-\gamma}\right)^{n/2} \theta^{i(\mu/2-1)} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)) < \left(\frac{2}{1-\gamma}\right)^{n/2} \varepsilon_0.$$

Hence provided  $\varepsilon_0$  is sufficiently small, by Lemma 2.16 and (2.30),

$$\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\theta^{i+1}(1-\gamma)/2}(\xi)) \leq \theta^{\mu/2-1} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\theta^i(1-\gamma)/2}(\xi)) \leq \left(\frac{2}{1-\gamma}\right)^{n/2} \theta^{(i+1)(\mu/2-1)} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)),$$

thereby proving that (2.30) holds true with  $i + 1$  in place of  $i$ .

Recall that (2.31) holds true for all  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, i_0 - 1\}$  and observe that

$$\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\theta^{i_0}(1-\gamma)/2}(\xi)) \leq \theta^{-n/2} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\theta^{i_0-1}(1-\gamma)/2}(\xi)) \leq \theta^{-n/2} \left(\frac{2}{1-\gamma}\right)^n \varepsilon_0.$$

Hence provided  $\varepsilon_0$  is sufficiently small, for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, i_0\}$  we can let  $u_i : B_{3\theta^i(1-\gamma)/8}(\xi) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and  $K_i \subset B_{3\theta^i(1-\gamma)/8}(\xi)$  be as in Theorem 2.9 with  $\xi$ ,  $\theta^i(1-\gamma)/2$ ,  $3/4$ ,  $u_i$ , and  $K_i$  in place of  $x_0$ ,  $\rho$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $u$ , and  $K$ . By Lemma 2.17 (with  $\gamma = 1/2$ ), for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, i_0\}$ , there exists  $a_i \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and associated sum of planes  $\mathbf{P}_i \in \mathcal{P}_q$  as in Definition 2.2 such that

$$(2.32) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\omega_n \theta^{i(n+2)}} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\theta^i(1-\gamma)/4}(\xi)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_i) d\|T\|(X) + \frac{1}{\omega_n \theta^{i(n+2)}} \int_{B_{\theta^i(1-\gamma)/4}(\xi)} \mathcal{G}(u_i, a_i)^2 \\ \leq C \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\theta^i(1-\gamma)/2}(\xi))^2 \leq C \theta^{2i(\mu/2-1)} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. When  $i = 0$ , let  $u_0 = u$  be the Lipschitz approximation of  $T$  in  $\mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0)$  and  $K = K_0$  as chosen above. Let  $a = a_0$  and  $\mathbf{P}_0 = \mathbf{P}$  be as chosen above so that (2.27) holds true. Provided  $\varepsilon_0$  is sufficiently small, by (2.5) for each  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, i_0 - 1\}$

$$(2.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^n(\{x \in B_{\theta^{i+1}(1-\gamma)/4}(\xi) : u_i(x) \neq u_{i+1}(x)\}) &\leq \mathcal{L}^n(B_{\theta^{i+1}(1-\gamma)/4}(\xi) \setminus (K_i \cup K_{i+1})) \\ &\leq C\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{\theta^i(1-\gamma)/2}(\xi))^{2+\alpha}\theta^{in} \leq C\varepsilon_0^{2+\alpha}\theta^{in} < \frac{1}{2}\omega_n \left(\frac{(1-\gamma)\theta^{i+1}}{4}\right)^n, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  are constants. Thus by the triangle inequality, (2.27), (2.32), and (2.33),

$$(2.34) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(a_i, a_{i+1})^2 &\leq \frac{C}{\theta^{(i+1)n}} \int_{B_{\theta^{i+1}(1-\gamma)/4}(\xi) \cap \{u_i = u_{i+1}\}} \mathcal{G}(u_{i+1}, a_i)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{C}{\theta^{(i+1)n}} \int_{B_{\theta^{i+1}(1-\gamma)/4}(\xi) \cap \{u_i \neq u_{i+1}\}} \mathcal{G}(u_{i+1}, a_{i+1})^2 \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\theta^{(i+1)n}} \int_{B_{\theta^i(1-\gamma)/4}(\xi)} \mathcal{G}(u_i, a_i)^2 + \frac{C}{\theta^{(i+1)n}} \int_{B_{\theta^{i+1}(1-\gamma)/4}(\xi)} \mathcal{G}(u_{i+1}, a_{i+1})^2 \\ &\leq C\theta^{\mu i} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. By applying (2.34) using the triangle inequality, for each integer  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, i_0\}$ ,

$$(2.35) \quad \mathcal{G}(a_i, a) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}(a_k, a_{k+1}) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} C\theta^{k\mu/2} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)) \leq C\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)),$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. By (2.27), (2.32), and (2.28), for each  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, i_0\}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\omega_n \theta^{i(n+2)}} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\theta^i(1-\gamma)/4}(\xi)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_i) d\|T\|(X) \leq C\theta^{2i(\mu/2-1)} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^2 \leq C\varepsilon_0^2 < \left(\frac{1-\gamma}{16}\right)^{n+2}$$

provided  $\varepsilon_0$  is sufficiently small, where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Thus by Lemma 2.8 (with  $1/2$ ,  $\eta_{(\xi,0),\theta^i(1-\gamma)/4\#}T$ , and  $\mathbf{P}_i$  in place of  $\gamma$ ,  $T$ , and  $\mathbf{P}$ ) and (2.32), for each  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, i_0\}$ ,

$$(2.36) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{\theta^i(1-\gamma)/8}(\xi)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_i) &\leq 2 \left( \frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\theta^i(1-\gamma)/4}(\xi)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_i) d\|T\|(X) \right)^{\frac{1}{n+2}} \\ &\leq C\theta^{i\frac{n+\mu}{n+2}} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^{\frac{2}{n+2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant.

Now fix  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(n, m, q, \gamma)$  small enough for the above discussion to hold true. By (2.29),

$$\theta^{i_0} \leq \left( \frac{\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))}{\varepsilon_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\mu/2}}.$$

Hence by (2.36)

$$(2.37) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{\theta^{i_0}(1-\gamma)/8}(\xi)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_{i_0}) \leq C \theta^{i_0 \frac{n+\mu}{n+2}} \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^{\frac{2}{n+2}} \\ \leq C \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^{\frac{1}{1-\mu/2} \cdot \frac{n+\mu}{n+2} + \frac{2}{n+2}} = C \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^{\frac{1}{1-\mu/2}},$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. By the triangle inequality, (2.35), and (2.37),

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{\theta^{i_0}(1-\gamma)/8}(\xi)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \\ & \leq \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{\theta^{i_0}(1-\gamma)/8}(\xi)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_{i_0}) + \sup_{X \in \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_{i_0}} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \\ & \leq \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{\theta^{i_0}(1-\gamma)/8}(\xi)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}_{i_0}) + \mathcal{G}(a_{i_0}, a) \leq C \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant, thereby proving (2.9).  $\square$

**Remark 2.18.** Let  $\mathbf{P}$  be as in Theorem 2.12 and let  $a \in \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  be the point associated with  $\mathbf{P}$  as in Definition 2.2. Then by Theorem 2.12

$$(2.38) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \leq C_0 \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))$$

for some constant  $C_0 = C_0(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Let

$$\{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) < 2C_0 \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \mathbb{R}^n \times U_i$$

where  $\{U_i\}$  is a collection of mutually disjoint, connected, open subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^m$  (and  $C_0$  is as in (2.38)). Then by (2.9),

$$T \llcorner \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0) = \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \quad \text{where} \quad T_i = T \llcorner (B_\gamma(0) \times U_i)$$

and  $T_i$  are locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents with  $(\partial T_i) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0) = 0$ . By the constancy theorem

$$(2.39) \quad \pi_\# T_i = q_i \llbracket B_\gamma(0) \rrbracket$$

for some integers  $q_i$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^N q_i = q$ . Provided  $\varepsilon_0$  is sufficiently small, by Lemma 2.7 we have that  $q_i \geq 0$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . Moreover, by Lemma 2.6,  $q_i = 0$  if and only if  $\text{spt } T_i \cap \mathbf{C}_{\gamma/2}(0) = \emptyset$ . We claim that provided  $\mathbf{P}$  satisfies (2.27) and (2.38) holds true for  $C_0 = C_0(n, m, q, \gamma)$  sufficiently large, we can guarantee that  $q_i > 0$  for all  $i$ . To see this, let  $u : B_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and  $K$  be as in Theorem 2.9 with  $x_0 = 0$ ,  $\rho = 1$ , and  $(3+\gamma)/4$  in place of  $\gamma$ . Provided  $\varepsilon_0$  is sufficiently small, by (2.27) and (2.5) there exists a set  $\Omega \subset K \cap B_{\gamma/2}(0)$  with  $\mathcal{L}^n(\Omega) \geq \frac{1}{2} \omega_n (\gamma/2)^n$  and

$$(2.40) \quad \mathcal{G}(u(x), a) \leq C_2 \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)) \text{ for all } x \in \Omega,$$

where  $C_2 = \sqrt{\frac{4C_1}{\omega_n (\gamma/2)^n}}$  (for  $C_1$  as in (2.27)). For each  $x \in \Omega$  let  $u(x) = \sum_{j=1}^q \llbracket u_j(x) \rrbracket$  where  $u_j(x) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . For each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  there is a plane  $P_{k(i)} = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{a_{k(i)}\}$  of  $\mathbf{P}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n \times U_i$ . By (2.40), for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  and  $x \in \Omega$  there exists  $j(i) \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$  such that  $X = (x, u_{j(i)}(x)) \in \text{spt } T$  and

$$\text{dist}(X, P_{k(i)}) \leq |u_{j(i)}(x) - a_{k(i)}| \leq \mathcal{G}(u(x), a) \leq C_2 \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)).$$

Hence provided we take  $C_0$  in (2.38) to be large enough that  $C_2 < 2C_0$  (where  $C_2$  is as in (2.40)),  $X \in \text{spt } T_i \cap \mathbf{C}_{\gamma/2}(0)$ . Therefore,  $q_i > 0$  in (2.39) for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ .

**2.4.  $L^\infty$ -distance estimate in terms of height excess relative to parallel planes.** In this section we prove Theorem 2.13. In the special case that  $\text{spt } \mathbf{P}$  is a single plane, Theorem 2.13 is a well-known consequence of estimates for subharmonic functions on minimal submanifolds, first established in [All72] (see Lemma 2.19 below). Here we focus on the case where  $P$  consists of two or more planes.

The proof of Theorem 2.13 proceeds by double induction on  $q$  and  $s$ . We find two planes of  $\mathbf{P}$  which are a distance  $\text{sep } \mathbf{P}$  apart and remove one of them to form  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ . We may assume that the  $L^2$ -distance of  $T$  to  $\mathbf{P}$  is much smaller than  $\text{sep } \mathbf{P}$ , otherwise the conclusion (2.11) readily follows by induction. Using the induction hypothesis, we show that  $T$  separates into locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents  $T_i$  (possibly zero) near the planes of  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ . If  $T$  separates into two or more non-zero locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents  $T_i$ , then by induction we again obtain (2.11). (Notice that for instance  $\text{spt } \mathbf{P}$  might consist of three planes  $P_1, P_2, P_3$  with  $T$  separating into a multiplicity two current  $T_1$  near  $P_1$  and a multiplicity one current  $T_2$  near  $P_2, P_3$ . To treat this possibility, we allow the number of planes of  $\mathbf{P}$  to be  $s > q$ ). If on the other hand the distance of  $T$  to a single plane  $P_1$  of  $\mathbf{P}$  is  $\leq C \text{sep } \mathbf{P}$ , by a blow-up argument (see Lemma 2.20) we see that since the  $L^2$ -distance of  $T$  to  $\mathbf{P}$  is much smaller than  $\text{sep } \mathbf{P}$ , the tilt excess of  $T$  is also much smaller than  $\text{sep } \mathbf{P}$ . Thus by Theorem 2.12, there is a sum-of-planes  $\mathbf{Q}$  such that the  $L^\infty$ -distance of  $T$  to  $\mathbf{Q}$  is much smaller than  $\text{sep } \mathbf{P}$ . One can show that the distance of  $\mathbf{P}$  to  $\mathbf{Q}$  is much smaller than  $\text{sep } \mathbf{P}$ . Thus  $T$  separates into locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents near each plane of  $\mathbf{P}$  and (2.11) follows again.

**Lemma 2.19.** *If  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  such that  $(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_1(0) = 0$  and  $T \llcorner \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0) \neq 0$  and if  $P$  is an  $n$ -dimensional affine plane in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ , then*

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X)$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality assume  $\text{spt } T \not\subseteq P$ . Choose an orthonormal basis  $\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_m$  for the orthogonal complement  $P^\perp$  of  $P$ . For  $0 < \delta < \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X)$ , let  $\phi_\delta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a smooth convex function such that  $\phi_\delta(t) = 0$  if  $|t| \leq \delta/2$  and  $\phi_\delta(t) = |t| - \delta$  if  $|t| \geq 2\delta$ . Noting that by [All72, Lemma 7.5(3)]  $f_i(x) = \phi_\delta(\nu_i \cdot x)$  is subharmonic on the stationary varifold  $V = |T|$  associated with  $T$  (see [KrumWic-a, Section 2.3]), apply [All72, Theorem 7.5(6)] to  $f_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.20.** *For all integers  $q \geq 1$  and  $s \geq 2$ , and for all  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\Lambda \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ , there exist  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n, m, q, s, \gamma, \Lambda, \eta) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q, s, \gamma, \Lambda, \eta) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_s$  and  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  such that*

$$(2.41) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_1(0) = 0, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T} \text{dist}(X, P_0) < \infty, \quad \pi_{\#} T = q \llbracket B_1(0) \rrbracket, \quad \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)) < \varepsilon,$$

$$(2.42) \quad \text{width } \mathbf{P} \leq \Lambda \text{sep } \mathbf{P},$$

$$(2.43) \quad \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) \leq \beta^2 (\text{sep } \mathbf{P})^2,$$

where  $\pi$  is the orthogonal projection map onto  $P_0$ , then

$$(2.44) \quad \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)) \leq \eta \text{sep } \mathbf{P}.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  and the integers  $q \geq 1$  and  $s \geq 2$ . Suppose to the contrary that for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  there are  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\beta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents



$T_k$  in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$ , and  $\mathbf{P}_k \in \mathcal{P}_s$  such that (2.41), (2.42), and (2.43) hold true with  $\varepsilon_k, \beta_k, T_k, \mathbf{P}_k$  in place of  $\varepsilon, \beta, T, \mathbf{P}$  but

$$(2.45) \quad \mathcal{E}(T_k, \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)) > \eta \operatorname{sep} \mathbf{P}_k.$$

Note that since  $\mathcal{E}(T_k, \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)) \rightarrow 0$ , (2.45) implies that  $\operatorname{sep} \mathbf{P}_k \rightarrow 0$ .

We have that  $\mathbf{P}_k = \sum_{i=1}^s \llbracket \mathbb{R}^n \times \{a_{k,i}\} \rrbracket$  for some  $a_k = \sum_{i=1}^s \llbracket a_{k,i} \rrbracket \in \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^m)$  associated with  $\mathbf{P}_k$  as in Definition 2.2. By translating, assume that  $a_{k,1} = 0$ . Then by (2.42)

$$(2.46) \quad |a_{k,i}| \leq \Lambda \operatorname{sep} \mathbf{P}_k$$

for all  $k \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$  and  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ . Note that  $P_0 = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{a_{k,1}\}$ . By the triangle inequality, (2.4), (2.42), and (2.43)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \operatorname{dist}^2(X, P_0) d\|T\|(X) &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \operatorname{dist}^2(X, \operatorname{spt} \mathbf{P}_k) d\|T\|(X) \\ &\quad + 2(q+1)\omega_n(\operatorname{width} \mathbf{P}_k)^2 \leq C(\operatorname{sep} \mathbf{P}_k)^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, q, \Lambda) \in (0, \infty)$ . Hence by Lemma 2.19,

$$(2.47) \quad \sup_{X \in \operatorname{spt} T_k \cap \mathbf{C}_{(7+\gamma)/8}(0)} \operatorname{dist}(X, P_0) \leq C \operatorname{sep} \mathbf{P}_k$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . By Lemma 2.11,

$$(2.48) \quad \mathcal{E}(T_k, \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0)) \leq C \operatorname{sep} \mathbf{P}_k.$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

For each sufficiently large  $k$  let  $u_k : B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and  $K_k \subset B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)$  be as in Theorem 2.9 and  $w_k : B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  be as in Theorems 2.10 with  $x_0 = 0$ ,  $\rho = 1$ , and  $\eta = 1/k$  and with  $\frac{2+2\gamma}{3+\gamma}, T_k, u_k, K_k$ , and  $w_k$  in place of  $\gamma, T, u, K$ , and  $w$ . By (2.47) and truncating  $u_k$  if necessary we may assume that

$$(2.49) \quad \sup_{B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} |u_k| \leq C \operatorname{sep} \mathbf{P}_k$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . For each  $x \in B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)$  we write  $u_k(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket u_{k,i}(x) \rrbracket$  where  $u_{k,i}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and we write  $w_k(x) = \sum_{i=1}^q \llbracket w_{k,i}(x) \rrbracket$  where  $w_{k,i}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . We let  $\operatorname{spt} a_k = \{a_{k,1}, \dots, a_{k,s}\}$  denote the set of all values of  $a_k$ . By the area formula, (2.5), (2.48), (2.49), and (2.43),

$$\begin{aligned} (2.50) \quad &\int_{B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^q \operatorname{dist}^2(u_{k,i}(x), \operatorname{spt} a_k) dx = \int_{B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^q \operatorname{dist}^2((x, u_{k,i}(x)), \operatorname{spt} \mathbf{P}_k) dx \\ &\leq \int_{(B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \setminus K_k) \times \mathbb{R}^m} \operatorname{dist}^2(X, \operatorname{spt} \mathbf{P}_k) d\|T_k\|(X) + C(\operatorname{sep} \mathbf{P}_k)^{4+\alpha} \\ &\leq \beta_k (\operatorname{sep} \mathbf{P}_k)^2 + C(\operatorname{sep} \mathbf{P}_k)^{4+\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  are constants. By (2.7), (2.48), (2.49), and (2.50),

$$(2.51) \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(\operatorname{sep} \mathbf{P}_k)^2} \int_{B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} |w_k|^2 \leq C,$$

$$(2.52) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(\operatorname{sep} \mathbf{P}_k)^2} \int_{B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^q \operatorname{dist}^2(w_{k,i}(x), \operatorname{spt} a_k) dx = 0,$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. By (2.51) and the compactness of Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued functions, after passing to a subsequence  $w_k/(\text{sep } \mathbf{P}_k) \rightarrow \tilde{w}$  uniformly in  $B_\gamma(0)$  for some Dirichlet energy minimizing function  $\tilde{w} : B_\gamma(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$ .

By (2.46), after passing to a subsequence for each  $i$  there exists  $\tilde{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $a_{k,i}/(\text{sep } \mathbf{P}_k) \rightarrow \tilde{a}_i$ . Set  $\tilde{a} = \sum_{i=1}^s \llbracket \tilde{a}_i \rrbracket \in \mathcal{A}_s(\mathbb{R}^m)$ . By (2.52),  $\text{spt } \tilde{w}(x) \subseteq \text{spt } \tilde{a}$  for each  $x \in B_\gamma(0)$ , where  $\text{spt } \tilde{w}(x)$  and  $\text{spt } \tilde{a}$  denote the set of all values of  $\tilde{w}(x)$  and  $\tilde{a}$ . Since  $\tilde{w}$  is continuous on  $B_\gamma(0)$  and  $\text{spt } \tilde{a}$  is a finite set,  $\tilde{w}$  must be a constant function on  $B_\gamma(0)$ . By the continuity of Dirichlet energy under uniform limits of Dirichlet energy minimizing  $q$ -valued functions [DelSpa11, Proposition 3.20], since  $w_k/(\text{sep } \mathbf{P}_k)$  converge uniformly to the constant function  $\tilde{w}$  in  $B_\gamma(0)$ ,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(\text{sep } \mathbf{P}_k)^2} \int_{B_\gamma(0)} |Dw_k|^2 = \int_{B_\gamma(0)} |D\tilde{w}|^2 = 0.$$

By (2.6), (2.7), and (2.48),

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2\omega_n \gamma^n \mathcal{E}(T_k, \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0))}{(\text{sep } \mathbf{P}_k)^2} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(\text{sep } \mathbf{P}_k)^2} \int_{B_\gamma(0)} |Du_k|^2 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(\text{sep } \mathbf{P}_k)^2} \int_{B_\gamma(0)} |Dw_k|^2 = 0,$$

thereby showing that (2.44) must hold true for all sufficiently large  $k$ , contrary to assumption.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.13.* We shall proceed by double induction on  $q$  and  $s$ . In the case  $s = 1$ , Theorem 2.13 holds true by Lemma 2.19. Suppose that  $q_0 \geq 1$  and  $s_0 > 1$  are integers such that

(H1) Theorem 2.13 holds true if  $q \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_0 - 1\}$  and  $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, s_0\}$  and

and either (i)  $q_0 = 1$  or (ii)  $q_0 > 1$  and

(H2) Theorem 2.13 holds true if  $q = q_0$  and  $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, s_0 - 1\}$ .

Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  such that (2.10) holds true with  $q = q_0$  and let  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{s_0}$ .

Notice that we may assume that  $\mathbf{P}$  consists of exactly  $s_0$  distinct planes, since otherwise there is a plane in  $\mathcal{P}_{s_0-1}$  with the same support as  $\mathbf{P}$  and thus by (H2), (2.11) holds true. Express  $\mathbf{P} = \sum_{i=1}^{s_0} \llbracket P_i \rrbracket$  and assume that  $P_{s_0-1}$  and  $P_{s_0}$  are a distance  $\text{sep } \mathbf{P}$  apart. Set  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}} = \sum_{i=1}^{s_0-1} \llbracket P_i \rrbracket \in \mathcal{P}_{s_0-1}$  so that

$$(2.53) \quad \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}} \subset \text{spt } \mathbf{P},$$

$$(2.54) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } \mathbf{P}} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}}) = \text{sep } \mathbf{P}.$$

Set

$$\tilde{H} = \left( \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}}) d\|T\|(X) \right)^{1/2}.$$

If  $\tilde{H} = 0$  then  $\text{spt } T \subset \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}} \subset \text{spt } \mathbf{P}$  and we have nothing further to prove. Thus we may assume that  $\tilde{H} > 0$ .

Let  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q_0, s_0, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  to be later determined. If

$$\int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) > \beta^2 (\text{sep } \mathbf{P})^2,$$

then by the triangle inequality, (2.4), and (2.54)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}}) d\|T\|(X) &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) + 2(q_0 + 1)\omega_n(\text{sep } \mathbf{P})^2 \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\beta^2} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, q_0) \in (0, \infty)$ . Hence by (H2) we can apply Theorem 2.13 together with (2.53) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) &\leq \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}}) \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}}) d\|T\|(X) \leq \frac{C}{\beta^2} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q_0, s_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants, thereby proving (2.11). Therefore, for the remainder of the proof we may assume that

$$(2.55) \quad \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) \leq \beta^2(\text{sep } \mathbf{P})^2.$$

Note that by the triangle inequality, (2.54), and (2.55)

$$\begin{aligned} (2.56) \quad \tilde{H}^2 &= \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}}) d\|T\|(X) \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) + 2(q_0 + 1)\omega_n(\text{sep } \mathbf{P})^2 \\ &\leq C(\text{sep } \mathbf{P})^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, q_0) \in (0, \infty)$

By (H2) we can apply Theorem 2.13 to obtain

$$(2.57) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}}) < C_0 \tilde{H}$$

for some constant  $C_0 = C_0(n, m, q_0, s_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Express

$$\{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}}) < C_0 \tilde{H}\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \mathbb{R}^n \times \tilde{U}_i$$

for some collection of mutually disjoint connected open subsets  $\{\tilde{U}_i\}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $C_0$  is as in (2.57). By (2.57),

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \tilde{T}_i \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{T}_i = T \llcorner B_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \times \tilde{U}_i.$$

Clearly  $(\partial \tilde{T}_i) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) = 0$ . By (2.10), the constancy theorem, and Lemma 2.7

$$\pi_{\#} \tilde{T}_i = \tilde{q}_i \llcorner [B_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0)]$$

for some integers  $\tilde{q}_i \geq 0$  such that  $q_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \tilde{q}_i$ . Moreover, by Lemma 2.6, whenever  $\tilde{q}_i = 0$  we have  $\tilde{T}_i \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) = 0$ . Hence if  $\tilde{q}_i = 0$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \tilde{N}\}$ , then  $\mathbf{P} \llcorner \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \setminus (\mathbb{R}^n \times \tilde{U}_i)$  is a sum of  $s_0 - 1$  or fewer planes parallel to  $P_0$ . Thus by (H2) we can apply Theorem 2.13 with  $\eta_{0, (1+\gamma)/2\#} T$  and  $\mathbf{P} \llcorner \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \setminus (\mathbb{R}^n \times \tilde{U}_i)$  in place of  $T$  and  $\mathbf{P}$  to obtain (2.11). Moreover, if  $\#\{i : \tilde{q}_i > 0\} \geq 2$ ,

then by (H1) for each  $i$  we can apply Theorem 2.13 with  $\eta_{0,(1+\gamma)/2\#}\tilde{T}_i$  in place of  $T$  and the sum of planes  $\mathbf{P}$  to obtain (2.11). Hence we may assume that  $N = 1$  and  $\tilde{q}_1 = q_0$ . It follows that

$$(2.58) \quad \text{width } \tilde{\mathbf{P}} \leq 2q_0C_0\tilde{H},$$

where  $C_0$  is as in (2.57). It follows using (2.53), (2.54), (2.56), and (2.58) that

$$(2.59) \quad \text{width } \mathbf{P} \leq C \text{ sep } \mathbf{P}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q_0, s_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

Let  $\eta = \eta(n, m, q_0, s_0, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  to be later determined. Provided  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q_0, s_0, \gamma, \eta)$  is sufficiently small, by (2.55) and (2.59) we can apply Lemma 2.20 to obtain

$$(2.60) \quad \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{(3+5\gamma)/8}(0)) \leq \eta \text{ sep } \mathbf{P}$$

By Theorem 2.12 there exists  $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{P}_{q_0}$  such that

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{(1+3\gamma)/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{Q}) \leq C \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_{(3+5\gamma)/8}(0))$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . In particular, by (2.60)

$$(2.61) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{(1+3\gamma)/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{Q}) < C_1 \eta \text{ sep } \mathbf{P}.$$

for some constant  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q_0, s_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  (which we require to be large enough that we can apply Remark 2.18). Express

$$\{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{Q}) < C_1 \eta \text{ sep } \mathbf{P}\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\hat{N}} \mathbb{R}^n \times \hat{U}_i$$

for some collection of mutually disjoint connected open subsets  $\{\hat{U}_i\}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $C_1$  is as in (2.61). By (2.61),

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{N}} \hat{T}_i \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{T}_i = T \llcorner B_{(1+3\gamma)/4}(0) \times \hat{U}_i.$$

Clearly  $(\partial \hat{T}_i) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{(1+3\gamma)/4}(0) = 0$ . By (2.10), constancy theorem, and Lemma 2.7

$$(2.62) \quad \pi_{\#} \hat{T}_i = \hat{q}_i \llcorner [B_{(1+3\gamma)/4}(0)]$$

for some integers  $\hat{q}_i \geq 0$  such that  $q_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{N}} \hat{q}_i$ . By Remark 2.18,  $\hat{q}_i > 0$  for all  $i$ . Given a plane  $Q_i \subset \text{spt } \mathbf{Q}$ ,  $Q_i$  lies in some  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \hat{U}_{j(i)}$  and the distance of each point  $X \in \text{spt } \hat{T}_{j(i)}$  to  $Q_i$  is  $\leq 2q_0C_1\eta \text{ sep } \mathbf{P}$ . Hence by the triangle inequality

$$\sup_{Y \in Q_i} \text{dist}(Y, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \leq \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) + \text{dist}(X, Q_i) \leq \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) + 2q_0C_1\eta \text{ sep } \mathbf{P}$$

for each  $X \in \text{spt } \hat{T}_{j(i)}$ . Integrating over  $\hat{T}_{j(i)}$  and using (2.55),

$$(2.63) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{Y \in \text{spt } \mathbf{Q}} \text{dist}(Y, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) &= \max_i \sup_{Y \in Q_i} \text{dist}(Y, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \\ &\leq \max_i \left( \frac{1}{q_0 \omega_n \left(\frac{1+3\gamma}{4}\right)^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{(1+3\gamma)/4}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|\hat{T}_{j(i)}\|(X) \right)^{1/2} + 2q_0C_1\eta \text{ sep } \mathbf{P} \\ &\leq \left( \frac{1}{q_0 \omega_n \left(\frac{1+3\gamma}{4}\right)^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{(1+3\gamma)/4}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) \right)^{1/2} + 2q_0C_1\eta \text{ sep } \mathbf{P} \\ &\leq C(\beta + \eta) \text{ sep } \mathbf{P} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q_0, s_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . By the triangle inequality, (2.61), and (2.63)

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{(1+3\gamma)/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) &\leq \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{(1+3\gamma)/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{Q}) + \sup_{X \in \text{spt } \mathbf{Q}} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \\ &\leq C(\beta + \eta) \text{sep } \mathbf{P} < \frac{1}{3} \text{sep } \mathbf{P}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q_0, s_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant and in the last step we assume that  $\beta$  and  $\eta$  are small enough that  $C(\beta + \eta) < 1/3$ . Hence

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^s T_i \quad \text{where} \quad T_i = T \llcorner \{X \in \mathbf{C}_{(1+3\gamma)/4}(0) : \text{dist}(X, P_i) < \frac{1}{3} \text{sep } \mathbf{P}\}.$$

We can apply Lemma 2.19 with  $\eta_{0, (1+3\gamma)/4\#} T_i$  and  $P_i$  in place of  $T$  and  $P$  to conclude that either  $T_i \llcorner \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0) = 0$  or

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_i \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_i) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{C}_{(1+3\gamma)/4}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_i) d\|T_i\|(X),$$

thereby proving (2.11).  $\square$

**2.5.  $L^\infty$ -distance estimate in terms of height excess relative to disjoint, not-necessarily-parallel planes.** In this section we prove Theorem 2.15, which extends Theorem 2.13 to the setting where  $\mathbf{P}$  is a sum of non intersecting affine planes which are not necessarily parallel.

Given  $1 < p \leq s$  and  $\mathbf{P} \in \Pi_{s,p}$  as in (2.12), we define

$$(2.64) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{minsep } \mathbf{P} &= \min_{1 \leq i \leq p} \inf_{X \in P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P} \setminus P_i), \\ \text{width } \mathbf{P} &= \max_{i \neq j} \sup_{X \in P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_j). \end{aligned}$$

If instead  $\mathbf{P} \in \Pi_{s,1}$ , we define  $\text{minsep } \mathbf{P} = \infty$  and  $\text{width } \mathbf{P} = 0$ . First in Lemma 2.21 we prove Theorem 2.15 with the additional assumptions that  $\text{minsep } \mathbf{P}$  is proportional to  $\text{width } \mathbf{P}$  and the  $L^2$ -distance of  $T$  to  $\mathbf{P}$  is much smaller than  $\text{minsep } \mathbf{P}$ . We prove Lemma 2.21 by showing that locally in cylinders with small radii we can replace the planes of  $\mathbf{P}$  with planes parallel to  $P_0$ . Theorem 2.15 in full generality will then follow by arguing much like in the proof of Theorem 2.13.

Note that in the proofs of Lemma 2.21 and Theorem 2.15, since we assume that  $|\vec{P}_i - \vec{P}_0| < \varepsilon_0$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , we may assume that

$$(2.65) \quad P_i = \{(x, b_i + A_i x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}, \quad \|A_i\| < 2\varepsilon_0$$

for some  $m \times n$  matrix  $A_i$  and some  $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . When  $p > 1$ , (2.14) gives us

$$(2.66) \quad \|A_i - A_j\| \leq 2\kappa \inf_{X \in P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_j)$$

for all  $i \neq j$ .

Let  $0 < \sigma \leq \rho$  and let  $P = \{(x, b + Ax) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$  be an  $n$ -dimensional affine plane, where  $A$  is an  $m \times n$  matrix and  $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . For  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , let  $z \in B_\sigma(0)$  such that  $Z = (z, b + Az)$  satisfies

$$\text{dist}(Z, P_i) = \inf_{X \in P \cap \mathbf{C}_\sigma(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_i).$$

Then by (2.65) and the triangle inequality

$$(2.67) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho(0), P \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho(0)) &\leq \sup_{x \in B_\rho(0)} |(b_i + A_i x) - (b + Ax)| \\ &\leq |(b_i + A_i z) - (b + Az)| + 2\rho \|A_i - A\| \\ &\leq 2 \inf_{X \in P \cap \mathbf{C}_\sigma(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_i) + 2\rho \|A_i - A\|. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if  $0 < \sigma \leq 1$  and  $A = A_j$  for some  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  with  $j \neq i$ , then by (2.66)

$$(2.68) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho(0), P_j \cap \mathbf{C}_\rho(0)) \leq (2 + 4\kappa\rho) \inf_{X \in P_j \cap \mathbf{C}_\sigma(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_i).$$

**Lemma 2.21.** *Let  $q \geq 1$  and  $1 < p \leq s$  be integers. For each  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0(n, m, q, s, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\eta(n, m, q, s, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\beta(n, m, q, s, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  and  $\mathbf{P} \in \Pi_{s,p}$  as in (2.12) such that (2.13) and (2.14) hold true and*

$$(2.69) \quad \inf_{1 \leq i \leq p} \frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_i) d\|T\|(X) < \eta^2,$$

$$(2.70) \quad \text{width } \mathbf{P} \leq \lambda \text{minsep } \mathbf{P},$$

$$(2.71) \quad \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) \leq \beta^2 (\text{minsep } \mathbf{P})^2.$$

Then

$$(2.72) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X)$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, s, \kappa, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality assume that  $\mathbf{P}$  is a sum of  $s$  distinct multiplicity one planes and thus  $p = s$ . By (2.69) we may assume that

$$(2.73) \quad \frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_1) d\|T\|(X) < \eta^2$$

By translating, assume that  $0 \in P_1$  and thus  $P_1 = \{(x, A_1 x) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$  where  $A_1$  is an  $m \times n$  matrix with  $\|A_1\| < 2\varepsilon_0$ . Thus

$$(2.74) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_1 \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0), P_0 \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)) \leq \|A_1\| < 2\varepsilon_0$$

where  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}$  denotes Hausdorff distance. By Lemma 2.8 and (2.73),

$$(2.75) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{(7+\gamma)/8}(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_1) \leq 2\eta^{\frac{2}{n+2}}.$$

By (2.74) and (2.75)

$$(2.76) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{(7+\gamma)/8}(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_0) &\leq \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{(7+\gamma)/8}(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_1) \\ &\quad + \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_1 \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0), P_0 \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)) \\ &\leq 2\eta^{\frac{2}{n+2}} + 2\varepsilon_0. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\pi_{P_1} : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow P_1$  denote the orthogonal projection map onto  $P_1$  and define the cylinder  $\mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0, P_1) = \pi_{P_1}^{-1}(P_1 \cap \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0))$ . By  $(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_1(0) = 0$ , (2.74), and (2.76),

$$(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0, P_1) = 0.$$

Thus by the constancy theorem,  $(\pi_{P_1 \# T}) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0)$  is a constant integer multiple of  $\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0)$ . It follows from (2.13), (2.74), and (2.75) that  $T$  is weakly close to  $q \llbracket P_1 \rrbracket$  in  $\mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0)$  and thus by the continuity of push-forwards in the weak topology

$$(\pi_{P_1 \# T}) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) = q \llbracket P_1 \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0).$$

By the triangle inequality, (2.13), and (2.4),

$$\int_{\mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0, P_1)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}_1|^2 d\|T\| \leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}_0|^2 d\|T\| + 2(q+1)\omega_n |\vec{P}_1 - \vec{P}_0|^2 \leq C\varepsilon_0^2$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Recalling (2.64), observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minsep } \mathbf{P} &\leq \min_{1 \leq i \leq p} \inf_{X \in P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0, P_1)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P} \setminus P_i), \\ \text{width } \mathbf{P} &\geq \max_{i \neq j} \sup_{X \in P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0, P_1)} \text{dist}(X, P_j). \end{aligned}$$

Thus by rotating  $P_1$  slightly to  $P_0$  and rescaling, we may assume that  $P_1 = P_0$  and  $\vec{P}_1 = \vec{P}_0$ .

Let  $0 < \sigma = \sigma(n, m, q, \gamma, \kappa, \lambda) < (1 - \gamma)/32$  be a constant depending to be later determined. Let  $\{B_\sigma(x_k) : k = 1, 2, \dots, K\}$  be a collection of balls such that  $x_k \in B_{(5+\gamma)/8}(0)$  for each  $k$ ,  $B_{(5+\gamma)/8}(0) \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^K B_\sigma(x_k)$ , and  $K \leq C(n, \gamma) \sigma^{-n}$ . Recall that

$$\mathbf{P} = \sum_{i=1}^s \llbracket P_i \rrbracket$$

for distinct oriented  $n$ -dimensional planes  $P_i$ . For each  $1 \leq k \leq K$  and  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , let  $y_{k,i} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $(x_k, y_{k,i})$  is the unique point of  $P_i \cap (\{x_k\} \times \mathbb{R}^m)$  and set  $\widehat{P}_{k,i} = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{y_{k,i}\}$ . For each  $1 \leq k \leq K$  define  $\widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k \in \mathcal{P}_q$  by

$$\widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k = \sum_{i=1}^s \llbracket \widehat{P}_{k,i} \rrbracket.$$

By (2.65), (2.66), and (2.70) and noting that since  $P_1 = P_0$  we have  $A_1 = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (2.77) \quad &\max_{1 \leq i \leq s} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\widehat{P}_{k,i} \cap \mathbf{C}_{2\sigma}(x_k), P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_{2\sigma}(x_k)) \\ &\leq 2\sigma \max_{1 \leq i \leq s} \|A_i\| = 2\sigma \max_{1 \leq i \leq s} \|A_i - A_1\| \leq 4\kappa\sigma \text{width } \mathbf{P} \leq 4\kappa\lambda\sigma \text{minsep } \mathbf{P}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\widehat{P}_{k,i} = \mathbb{R}^n \times \{y_{k,i}\}$  and  $(x_k, y_{k,i}) \in P_i$  for each  $k$  and  $i$ ,

$$(2.78) \quad \text{minsep } \mathbf{P} \leq \min_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} |y_{k,i} - y_{k,j}| = \text{sep } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k.$$

Provided  $\eta^{\frac{2}{n+2}} < \sigma$ , by (2.75) and  $P_1 = P_0$ ,

$$\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{2\sigma}(x_k) = \text{spt } T \cap (B_{2\sigma}^n(x_k) \times B_{\frac{2}{2\eta^{\frac{2}{n+2}}}}(y_{k,1})) \subset \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{4\sigma}(x_k, y_{k,1}).$$

Hence by the monotonicity formula, (2.4), and  $\mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)) < \varepsilon_0 < 1$ ,

$$(2.79) \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma}(x_k)) \leq \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_{4\sigma}(x_k, y_{k,1})) \leq \omega_n (4\sigma)^n \|T\|(\mathbf{C}_1(0)) \leq (q+1)\omega_n (4\sigma)^n.$$

Recalling (2.65), let  $X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{2\sigma}(x_k)$  and find  $Z \in \text{spt } \mathbf{P} \cap \mathbf{C}_{2\sigma}(x_k)$  such that  $|X - Z| \leq 2 \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P})$ . By the triangle inequality,

$$(2.80) \quad \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k) \leq |X - Z| + \text{dist}(Z, \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k) \leq 2 \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) + \text{dist}(Z, \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k).$$

By squaring and integrating (2.80) over  $\|T\|$ -a.e.  $X \in \mathbf{C}_{2\sigma}(x_k)$  and using (2.79), (2.71), and (2.77),

$$(2.81) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\omega_n(2\sigma)^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma}(x_k)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k) d\|T\|(X) \\ & \leq \frac{8}{\omega_n(2\sigma)^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma}(x_k)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) + C \sup_{Z \in \text{spt } \mathbf{P} \cap \mathbf{C}_{2\sigma}(x_k)} \text{dist}^2(Z, \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k) \\ & \leq C \left( \frac{\beta^2}{\sigma^n} + \sigma^2 \right) (\text{minsep } \mathbf{P})^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, q, \gamma, \kappa, \lambda) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. In particular, by (2.78),

$$(2.82) \quad \frac{1}{\omega_n(2\sigma)^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma}(x_k)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k) d\|T\|(X) \leq C \left( \frac{\beta^2}{\sigma^n} + \sigma^2 \right) (\text{sep } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k)^2$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, q, \gamma, \kappa, \lambda) \in (0, \infty)$ . By Theorem 2.13,

$$(2.83) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\sigma(x_k)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k) \leq \frac{C}{\sigma^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{2\sigma}(x_k)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k) d\|T\|(X)$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . By (2.82) and (2.83),

$$(2.84) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\sigma(x_k)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k) \leq C \left( \frac{\beta^2}{\sigma^n} + \sigma^2 \right)^{1/2} \text{sep } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma, \kappa, \lambda) \in (0, \infty)$ . Choose  $\sigma$  so that  $4\kappa\lambda\sigma < 1/9$  and  $C\sigma < 1/9$  (for  $C$  is as in (2.84)). Then choose  $\beta$  so that  $C\beta\sigma^{-n/2} < 1/9$  (for  $C$  is as in (2.84)). Hence by (2.84)

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\sigma(x_k)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k) < \frac{2}{9} \text{sep } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k.$$

Hence

$$T_{k,i} = T \llcorner \left\{ X \in \mathbf{C}_\sigma(x_k) : \text{dist}(X, \widehat{P}_{k,i}) < \frac{2}{9} \text{sep } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k \right\}$$

are locally area minimizing rectifiable currents of  $\mathbf{C}_\sigma(x_k)$  such that  $(\partial T_{k,i}) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_\sigma(x_k) = 0$  and

$$(2.85) \quad T \llcorner \mathbf{C}_\sigma(x_k) = \sum_{i=1}^N T_{k,i}$$

and

$$(2.86) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_{k,i}} \text{dist}(X, \widehat{P}_{k,i}) < \frac{2}{9} \text{sep } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Moreover, for each  $X \in \text{spt } T_{k,i}$  there exists  $Z \in \widehat{P}_{k,i} \cap \mathbf{C}_\sigma(x_k)$  such that  $|X - Z| \leq 2 \text{dist}(X, \widehat{P}_{k,i})$ . Thus by the triangle inequality, (2.86) and (2.77) (recalling that  $4\kappa\lambda\sigma < 1/9$ ),

$$(2.87) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_{k,i}} \text{dist}(X, P_i) \leq 2 \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_{k,i}} \text{dist}(X, \widehat{P}_{k,i}) + \sup_{Z \in \widehat{P}_{k,i} \cap \mathbf{C}_\sigma(x_k)} \text{dist}(Z, P_i) < \frac{1}{3} \text{minsep } \mathbf{P}.$$

It follows from (2.85) and (2.87) that

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{(5+\gamma)/8}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) < \frac{1}{3} \text{minsep } \mathbf{P}.$$

Hence

$$T_i = T \llcorner \left\{ X \in \mathbf{C}_{(5+\gamma)/8}(0) : \text{dist}(X, P_i) < \frac{1}{3} \text{sep } \widehat{\mathbf{P}}_k \right\}$$



are locally area minimizing rectifiable currents of  $\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)$  such that  $(\partial T_i)_\# \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) = 0$  and

$$T_\# \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) = \sum_{i=1}^N T_i, \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_i} \text{dist}(X, P_i) \leq \frac{1}{3} \text{minsep } \mathbf{P}.$$

(Note that we can characterize  $T_i$  by

$$T_{i\#}(\mathbf{C}_\sigma(x_k) \cap \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)) = T_{k,i\#}(\mathbf{C}_\sigma(x_k) \cap \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0))$$

for each  $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ .) We can apply Lemma 2.19 with  $T_i$  and  $P_i$  in place of  $T$  and  $P$  to obtain (2.72).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.15.* Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\mathbf{P}$  is a sum of  $s$  distinct multiplicity one planes and thus  $p = s$ . We shall proceed by double induction on  $q$  and  $s$ . The base case  $s = 1$  follows from Lemma 2.19. Suppose that  $q_0 \geq 1$  and  $s_0 > 1$  are integers such that

(H3) Theorem 2.15 holds true if  $q \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_0 - 1\}$  and  $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, s_0\}$  and

and either (i)  $q_0 = 1$  or (ii)  $q_0 > 1$  and

(H4) Theorem 2.15 holds true if  $q = q_0$  and  $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, s_0 - 1\}$ .

Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  and  $\mathbf{P} \in \Pi_{s_0}$  be a sum of  $s_0$  distinct multiplicity one planes such that (2.13) and (2.14) hold true (with  $q = q_0$  and  $p = s_0$ ).

First notice that by Theorem 2.12 there exists  $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{P}_{q_0}$  such that

$$(2.88) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{Q}) \leq C_0 \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)) < C_0 \varepsilon_0$$

for some constant  $C_0 = C_0(n, m, q_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  (which we require to be large enough that we can apply Remark 2.18 below). Express

$$\{X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{Q}) \leq C_0 \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \mathbb{R}^n \times U_i$$

for some collection of mutually disjoint connected open subsets  $\{U_i\}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $C_0$  is as in (2.88). By (2.88),

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \quad \text{where} \quad T_i = T_\# B_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \times U_i.$$

Clearly  $T_i$  are locally area minimizing rectifiable currents of  $\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)$  such that  $(\partial T_i)_\# \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0) = 0$ . By (2.13), the constancy theorem, and Lemma 2.7

$$(2.89) \quad \pi_\# T_i = q_i \llbracket B_\gamma(0) \rrbracket$$

for some integers  $q_i \geq 0$  such that  $q_0 = \sum_{i=1}^N q_i$ . By Remark 2.18,  $q_i > 0$  for all  $i$ . Let  $Q_i$  be a plane of  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $Z \in Q_i \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)$ . We know that  $Q_i$  lies in  $\mathbb{R}^n \times U_{j(i)}$  for some  $j(i) \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  and thus for each  $X \in \text{spt } T_{j(i)} \cap \{\pi(Z)\} \times \mathbb{R}^m$  we have  $|X - Z| \leq 2q_0 C_0 \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))$ . Hence by (2.67) (with  $P = Q_i$ ) and the triangle inequality

$$(2.90) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{Y \in Q_i \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}(Y, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) &\leq 2 \text{dist}(Z, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) + 2 \max_{1 \leq k \leq s_0} |A_k| \\ &\leq 2 \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) + 2|X - Z| + 2 \max_{1 \leq k \leq s_0} |A_k| \\ &\leq 2 \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) + 4q_0 C_0 \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0)) + 2 \max_{1 \leq k \leq s_0} |A_k|. \end{aligned}$$

By integrating (2.90) over  $T_{j(i)}$  and using (2.89),

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{Y \in Q_i \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(Y, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) &\leq \frac{3}{q_0 \omega_n \gamma^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T_{j(i)}\|(X) \\ &\quad + 48q_0^2 C_0^2 \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^2 + 12 \max_{1 \leq k \leq s_0} |A_k|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all  $i$  and thus

$$(2.91) \quad \sup_{Y \in \text{spt } \mathbf{Q} \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(Y, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \leq \frac{3}{q_0 \omega_n \gamma^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T_{j(i)}\|(X) \\ + 48q_0^2 C_0^2 \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^2 + 12 \max_{1 \leq k \leq s_0} |A_k|^2.$$

By (2.88) and (2.91),

$$(2.92) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{Q}) + 2 \sup_{Y \in \text{spt } \mathbf{Q} \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(Y, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) \\ &\leq \frac{6}{q_0 \omega_n \gamma^n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) + 98q_0^2 C_0^2 \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^2 + 24 \max_{1 \leq k \leq s_0} |A_k|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Thus if

$$\frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) \geq \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^2 + \max_{1 \leq k \leq s_0} |A_k|^2$$

then it follows from (2.92) that (2.15) holds true. Hence we may assume that

$$(2.93) \quad \frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) \leq \mathcal{E}(T, \mathbf{C}_1(0))^2 + \max_{1 \leq k \leq s_0} |A_k|^2 < 5\varepsilon_0^2.$$

Provided  $\varepsilon_0$  is sufficiently small, by Lemma 2.8 and (2.93),

$$(2.94) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) < 2(5\varepsilon_0^2)^{\frac{1}{n+2}} < 10\varepsilon_0^{\frac{2}{n+2}}$$

Express

$$\{X \in \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) : \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) < 20\varepsilon_0^{\frac{2}{n+2}}\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\widehat{N}} \widehat{U}_i$$

for some collection of mutually disjoint connected open subsets  $\{\widehat{U}_i\}$  of  $\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)$ . By (2.94),

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{T}_i \quad \text{where} \quad \widehat{T}_i = \widehat{T}_i \llcorner \widehat{U}_i.$$

Clearly  $(\partial \widehat{T}_i) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0) = 0$ . By (2.13), the constancy theorem, and Lemma 2.7

$$\pi_{\#} \widehat{T}_i = \widehat{q}_i \llcorner [B_\gamma(0)]$$

for some integers  $\widehat{q}_i \geq 0$  such that  $q_0 = \sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{q}_i$ . By Lemma 2.6, whenever  $\widehat{q}_i = 0$  we have  $\widehat{T}_i \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) = 0$ . Hence if  $\widehat{q}_i = 0$  for some  $i$ , then  $\mathbf{P} \llcorner (\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \setminus \widehat{U}_i)$  is a sum-of-planes in  $\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)$  consisting of  $s_0 - 1$  or fewer planes. Hence by (H4) we can apply Theorem 2.15 with  $\eta_{0, (1+\gamma)/2\#} T$  and  $\eta_{0, (1+\gamma)/2\#} (\mathbf{P} \llcorner (\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \setminus \widehat{U}_i))$  in place of  $T$  and  $\mathbf{P}$  to obtain (2.15). Moreover, if  $\#\{i : \widehat{q}_i > 0\} \geq 2$ , then by (H3) for each  $i$  we can apply Theorem 2.15 with  $\eta_{0, (1+\gamma)/2\#} \widehat{T}_i$  in place of  $T$  and the sum of planes  $\mathbf{P}$  to obtain (2.15). Hence we may assume that  $\widehat{N} = 1$  and

$\widehat{q}_1 = q_0$ . It follows that up to reordering the planes  $P_i$  of  $\widehat{\mathbf{P}}$ , for each  $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, s_0 - 1\}$  there exists  $j(i) \in \{1, 2, \dots, i - 1\}$  such that

$$\inf_{X \in P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_{j(i)}) \leq 20\varepsilon_0^{\frac{2}{n+2}}$$

Thus by (2.68)

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0), P_{j(i)} \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)) \leq (2 + 4\kappa) \inf_{X \in P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_{j(i)}) \leq 40(1 + 2\kappa)\varepsilon_0^{\frac{2}{n+2}}.$$

Therefore

$$(2.95) \quad \text{width } \mathbf{P} \leq 40q_0(1 + 2\kappa)\varepsilon_0^{\frac{2}{n+2}}.$$

Express  $\mathbf{P} = \sum_{i=1}^{s_0} \llbracket P_i \rrbracket$  and assume that

$$\inf_{X \in P_{s_0} \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_{s_0-1}) = \text{minsep } \mathbf{P}.$$

By (2.68)

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_{s_0-1} \cap \mathbf{C}_2(0), P_{s_0} \cap \mathbf{C}_2(0)) \leq (2 + 8\kappa) \inf_{X \in P_{s_0} \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_{s_0-1}) = (2 + 8\kappa) \text{minsep } \mathbf{P}.$$

Set  $\widetilde{\mathbf{P}} = \sum_{i=1}^{s_0-1} \llbracket P_i \rrbracket \in \Pi_{s_0-1}$  so that

$$(2.96) \quad \text{spt } \widetilde{\mathbf{P}} \subset \text{spt } \mathbf{P},$$

$$(2.97) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \widetilde{\mathbf{P}} \cap \mathbf{C}_2(0), \text{spt } \mathbf{P} \cap \mathbf{C}_2(0)) \leq (2 + 8\kappa) \text{minsep } \mathbf{P}.$$

Set

$$\widetilde{H} = \left( \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}) d\|T\|(X) \right)^{1/2}.$$

If  $\widetilde{H} = 0$  then  $\text{spt } T \subset \text{spt } \widetilde{\mathbf{P}} \subset \text{spt } \mathbf{P}$  and we have nothing further to prove. Thus we may assume that  $\widetilde{H} > 0$ .

Let  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q_0, s_0, \kappa, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  to be later determined. If

$$\int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) > \beta^2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}) d\|T\|(X),$$

then by (H4) we can apply Theorem 2.15 together with (2.96) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) &\leq \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_\gamma(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}) \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}) d\|T\|(X) \leq \frac{C}{\beta^2} \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X), \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q_0, s_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ , proving (2.15). Hence for the remainder of the proof we may assume that

$$(2.98) \quad \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) \leq \beta^2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}) d\|T\|(X).$$

By the triangle inequality, (2.4), (2.97), and (2.98)

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}}) d\|T\|(X) \\ & \leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) + 2(q_0 + 1)\omega_n(2 + 8\kappa)^2(\text{minsep } \mathbf{P})^2 \\ & \leq 2\beta^2 \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}}) d\|T\|(X) + 2(q_0 + 1)\omega_n(2 + 8\kappa)^2(\text{minsep } \mathbf{P})^2, \end{aligned}$$

so taking  $\beta < 1/2$  we have that

$$(2.99) \quad \tilde{H}^2 = \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}}) d\|T\|(X) \leq 4(q_0 + 1)\omega_n(2 + 8\kappa)^2(\text{minsep } \mathbf{P})^2.$$

In particular, by (2.98) and (2.99)

$$(2.100) \quad \int_{\mathbf{C}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\|(X) \leq 4(q_0 + 1)\omega_n(2 + 8\kappa)^2\beta^2(\text{minsep } \mathbf{P})^2.$$

By (H4) we can apply Theorem 2.15 to obtain

$$(2.101) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}}) < C_1 \tilde{H}$$

for some constant  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q_0, s_0, \kappa, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Express

$$\{X \in \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) : \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}}) < C_1 \tilde{H}\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \tilde{U}_i$$

for some collection of mutually disjoint connected open subsets  $\{\tilde{U}_i\}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ , where  $C_1$  is as in (2.101). By (2.101),

$$T = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \tilde{T}_i \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{T}_i = T \llcorner \tilde{U}_i.$$

Clearly  $(\partial \tilde{T}_i) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) = 0$ . By (2.13), the constancy theorem, and Lemma 2.7

$$\pi_{\#} \tilde{T}_i = \tilde{q}_i \llcorner [B_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0)]$$

for some integers  $\tilde{q}_i \geq 0$  such that  $q_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \tilde{q}_i$ . Moreover, by Lemma 2.6, whenever  $\tilde{q}_i = 0$  we have  $\tilde{T}_i \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) = 0$ . Hence if  $\tilde{q}_i = 0$  for some  $i$ , then  $\mathbf{P} \llcorner (\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \setminus \tilde{U}_i)$  is a sum-of-planes in  $\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)$  consisting of  $s_0 - 1$  or fewer planes. Hence by (H4) we can apply Theorem 2.15 with  $\eta_{0, (1+\gamma)/2\#} T$  and  $\eta_{0, (1+\gamma)/2\#} (\mathbf{P} \llcorner (\mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \setminus \tilde{U}_i))$  in place of  $T$  and  $\mathbf{P}$  to obtain (2.15). Moreover, if  $\#\{i : \tilde{q}_i > 0\} \geq 2$ , then by (H3) we can apply Theorem 2.15 with  $\eta_{0, (1+\gamma)/2\#} \tilde{T}_i$  in place of  $T$  and the sum of planes  $\mathbf{P}$  to obtain (2.15). Hence we may assume that  $\tilde{N} = 1$  and  $\tilde{q}_1 = q_0$ . It follows that up to reordering the planes  $P_i$  of  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ , assuming  $s_0 > 2$  for each  $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, s_0 - 1\}$  there exists  $j(i) \in \{1, 2, \dots, i - 1\}$  such that

$$\inf_{X \in P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_j) \leq 2C_1 \tilde{H},$$

where  $C_1$  is as in (2.101). Thus by (2.68)

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0), P_{j(i)} \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)) \leq (2 + 4\kappa) \inf_{X \in P_i \cap \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_{j(i)}) \leq 2(1 + 2\kappa)C_1 \tilde{H}.$$

Hence

$$(2.102) \quad \text{width } \tilde{\mathbf{P}} \leq 4q_0(1 + 2\kappa)C_1\tilde{H},$$

where  $C_1$  is as in (2.101). (Note that in the case  $s_0 = 2$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$  has exactly one plane and thus  $\text{width } \tilde{\mathbf{P}} = 0$ .) Hence by the definition of  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ , (2.97), (2.99), and (2.102)

$$(2.103) \quad \text{width } \mathbf{P} \leq \text{width } \tilde{\mathbf{P}} + \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{P}} \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0), \text{spt } \mathbf{P} \cap \mathbf{C}_1(0)) \leq C \text{minsep } \mathbf{P}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q_0, s_0, \kappa, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Now provided  $\beta$  is sufficiently small, by (2.94), (2.95), (2.103), and (2.100) we can apply Lemma 2.21 with  $\eta_{0, (1+\gamma)/2\#} T$  and  $\eta_{0, (1+\gamma)/2\#} \mathbf{P}$  in place of  $T$  and  $\mathbf{P}$  to prove (2.15).  $\square$

### 3. ESTIMATES FOR AREA MINIMIZING CURRENTS SIGNIFICANTLY CLOSER TO A UNION OF PLANES MEETING ALONG AN $(n - 2)$ -DIMENSIONAL SUBSPACE THAN TO ANY SINGLE PLANE

Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be an  $n$ -dimensional rectifiable current of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  whose support is a union of  $p$  ( $p \geq 2$ ) distinct  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes  $P_i$  intersecting along  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with  $\partial T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0$  which is weakly close to  $\mathbf{C}$ . Assume that  $T$  is significantly closer to  $\mathbf{C}$  than to any sum-of-planes supported on fewer distinct planes than  $p$  (in the sense of Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$  below). In analogy with the situations considered in [Sim93] and [Wic14], we wish to express  $T$ , away from the singular axis  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  of  $\mathbf{C}$ , as the graph of an appropriate function over the planes of  $\mathbf{C}$ . In [Sim93], the key hypothesis that allows one to do this is that  $T$  (which is a stationary varifold not assumed to be area minimizing) belongs to a ‘‘multiplicity 1 class,’’ this makes it possible to apply Allard’s regularity theorem away from the singular axis of  $\mathbf{C}$  (subject only to the assumption that  $T$  is sufficiently weakly close to  $\mathbf{C}$ , with Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$  being vacuous in that setting). The situation considered in [Wic14] allows higher multiplicity, but still there is a ‘‘sheeting theorem’’ applicable which guarantees complete  $C^{1,\alpha}$  regularity of  $T$  (which is a stable, stationary codimension 1 varifold in that setting) away from the singular axis of  $\mathbf{C}$ .

In contrast to either of these settings, in the present circumstances there is no regularity theory applicable to  $T$  that would provide complete regularity of  $T$  away from the axis  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . The basic result we use as a substitute for such regularity is our height estimate, Theorem 2.15. We use Theorem 2.15 to show (in Section 3.1 and Section 3.2 below) that away from  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ ,  $T$  separates as the sum of locally area minimizing rectifiable currents  $T_i$  such that  $T_i$  is close to  $P_i$  for each  $i$ . Applying Almgren’s Strong Lipschitz Approximation Theorem (Theorem 2.9), we then approximate  $T_i$  (in Theorem 3.4) by the graph of a Lipschitz multi-valued function  $u_i$  over an appropriate domain in  $P_i$ .

In Sections 3.3-3.5 we establish a number of key estimates, analogous to those in [Sim93], [Wic14], for area minimizing currents  $T$  satisfying appropriate hypothesis including Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ . These results will allow us to produce (in Section 4) ‘‘fine blow-ups’’ of sequences of area-minimizing currents  $(T_k)$  relative to sequences of sums-of-planes  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$  (of the type  $\mathbf{C}$  as above), with  $T_k, \mathbf{C}_k$  satisfying appropriate hypotheses including Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , and study the asymptotic behaviour of the fine blow-ups which ultimately leads to the main excess decay result of the present work, Theorem 4.13.

**3.1. Notation and statement of graphical representation results.** Given an  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ , we let  $\pi_P : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow P$  denote the orthogonal projection map onto  $P$  and we let  $\pi_{P^\perp} : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow P^\perp$  denote the orthogonal projection map onto the orthogonal complement  $P^\perp$ . For

each  $X_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and  $\rho > 0$  we define

$$\begin{aligned} B_\rho(X_0, P) &= \{X_0 + X : X \in P \text{ with } |X| < \rho\}, \\ \mathbf{C}_\rho(X_0, P) &= \{X_0 + X + Y : X \in P \text{ with } |X| < \rho \text{ and } Y \in P^\perp\}. \end{aligned}$$

We define the classes  $\mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  of sums-of-planes as follows:

**Definition 3.1.** Given integers  $p, q$  with  $1 \leq p \leq q$ , let  $\mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  be the set of all  $n$ -dimensional rectifiable currents  $\mathbf{C}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{m+n}$  of the form

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket$$

where  $q_1, \dots, q_p$  are positive integers such that  $\sum_{i=1}^p q_i = q$  and  $P_i$  are distinct  $n$ -dimensional planes such that  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset P_1$  if  $p = 1$ , and  $P_i \cap P_j = \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  for  $i \neq j$  if  $p \geq 2$ . Each plane  $P_i$  is oriented by the unit simple  $n$ -vector denoted  $\vec{P}_i$ .

**Remark 3.2.** We do not assume that every  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  is area minimizing.

For  $1 < p \leq q$  and  $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ , we let

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{minsep } \mathbf{C} &= \min_{1 \leq i \leq p} \inf_{X \in P_i \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \setminus P_i), \\ \text{maxsep } \mathbf{C} &= \min_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sup_{X \in P_i \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \setminus P_i). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}$ , we define  $\text{minsep } \mathbf{C} = \infty$  and  $\text{maxsep } \mathbf{C} = \infty$ .  $\text{minsep } \mathbf{C}$  is proportional to the least distance between a pair of points on different planes of  $\mathbf{C}$  in  $\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  and quantifies how close any pair of planes of  $\mathbf{C}$  are to intersecting away from  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ .  $\text{maxsep } \mathbf{C}$  is proportional to the least Hausdorff distance between a pair of distinct planes of  $\mathbf{C}$  in  $\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  and quantifies how close any two or more planes of  $\mathbf{C}$  are to coinciding. Clearly  $\text{minsep } \mathbf{C} \leq \text{maxsep } \mathbf{C}$ . However, in contrast with [Wic14], which considered half-planes meeting along an  $(n-1)$ -dimensional linear subspace, in the present setting  $\text{minsep } \mathbf{C}$  and  $\text{maxsep } \mathbf{C}$  need not be equal.

Throughout the paper, we shall use the following notation: for each  $\rho > 0$ ,  $n$ -dimensional rectifiable current  $T$  of  $\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)$ , and  $\mathbf{C} \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned} E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_\rho(0)) &= \left( \frac{1}{\omega_n \rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) \right)^{1/2}, \\ Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_\rho(0)) &= \left( \frac{1}{\omega_n \rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\omega_n \rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\rho/2}(0) \cap \{r > \rho/16\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $r = r(X) = \text{dist}(X, \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})$  for each  $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . In Theorem 3.4 and a number of other results in subsequent sections, we shall assume the first or both of the following hypotheses for appropriate choices of small constants  $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta_0 \in (0, 1)$ :

**Hypothesis ( $\star$ ).**  $2 \leq p \leq q$  are integers,  $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ , and  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  such that

$$(3.3) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0, \quad \Theta(T, 0) \geq q, \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq (q + 1/2) \omega_n,$$

$$(3.4) \quad E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \varepsilon_0.$$

**Hypothesis (★★).**  $2 \leq p \leq q$  are integers,  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ , and  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  such that

$$(3.5) \quad Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq \beta_0 \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}}$$

**Remark 3.3.** Suppose that  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis (★) and Hypothesis (★★) for some  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0 \in (0, 1)$ . If  $\mathbf{C}^* \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  is any other cone with  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C}^* = \text{spt } \mathbf{C}$ , then Hypothesis (★) and Hypothesis (★★) continue to be satisfied with  $\mathbf{C}^*$ ,  $\sqrt{q}\beta_0$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}$ ,  $\beta_0$  respectively.

**Theorem 3.4.** *Given integers  $2 \leq p \leq q$  and  $0 < \tau < \gamma < 1$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(n, m, q, p, \gamma, \tau) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n, m, q, p, \gamma, \tau) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis (★) and Hypothesis (★★), then:*

(a)  $\mathbf{C}$  satisfies

$$(3.6) \quad \text{minsep } \mathbf{C} \geq c \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}}$$

$$(3.7) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_j \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq C \inf_{X \in P_i \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}(X, P_j) \text{ for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq p,$$

where  $c = c(n, m, q, p) > 0$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, p) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants;

(b) after replacing  $\mathbf{C}$  with a cone with the same support (also denoted by  $\mathbf{C}$ ) there exist  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable currents  $T_i$  in  $\mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \{r > \tau/4\}$  for which

$$(3.8) \quad T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \{r > \tau/4\} = \sum_{i=1}^p T_i,$$

$$(3.9) \quad (\partial T_i) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \{r > \tau/4\} = 0,$$

$$(3.10) \quad (\pi_{P_i \#} T_i) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \cap \{r > \tau/2\} = q_i \llcorner [P_i] \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \cap \{r > \tau/2\},$$

$$(3.11) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_i \cap \{r > \sigma\}} \text{dist}(X, P_i) \leq C_\sigma E \text{ for all } \sigma \in [\tau/2, 1/2],$$

where  $r(X) = \text{dist}(X, \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})$ ,  $E = E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ , and  $C_\sigma = C_\sigma(n, m, q, p, \gamma, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants;

(c) for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  there exists Lipschitz  $q_i$ -valued functions  $u_i : B_\gamma(0, P_i) \cap \{r > \tau\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(P_i^\perp)$  and closed sets  $K_i \subseteq B_\gamma(0, P_i) \cap \{r > \tau\}$  such that

$$(3.12) \quad T_i \llcorner \pi_{P_i}^{-1}(K_i) = (\text{graph } u_i) \llcorner \pi_{P_i}^{-1}(K_i),$$

$$(3.13) \quad \mathcal{H}^n(B_\gamma(0, P_i) \cap \{r > \sigma\} \setminus K_i) + \|T_i\|(\pi_{P_i}^{-1}(B_\gamma(0, P_i) \cap \{r > \sigma\}) \setminus K_i) \leq C_\sigma E^{2+\alpha},$$

$$(3.14) \quad \sup_{B_\gamma(0, P_i) \cap \{r > \sigma\}} |u_i| \leq C_\sigma E, \quad \sup_{B_\gamma(0, P_i) \cap \{r > \sigma\}} |\nabla u_i| \leq C_\sigma E^\alpha$$

for all  $\sigma \in [\tau, 1/2]$ , where again  $E = E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$  and  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $C_\sigma = C_\sigma(n, m, q, p, \gamma, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants.

Theorem 3.4 will follow from Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6, which will provide a local graphical representation of locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents  $T$  in annuli. Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6 will also play an important role in the proof of Theorem 3.9 in the next section. Here and subsequently, we shall use the following notation: for each  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ ,  $\rho > 0$ , and  $\kappa \in (0, 2]$ , we let  $A_{\rho, \kappa}(\zeta) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho, \kappa}(\zeta) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  be annuli given by

$$A_{\rho, \kappa}(\zeta) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} : (|x| - \rho)^2 + |y - \zeta|^2 < \kappa^2(1 - \gamma)^2 \rho^2 / 64\},$$

$$\mathbf{A}_{\rho, \kappa}(\zeta) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2+m} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} : (|x| - \rho)^2 + |y - \zeta|^2 < \kappa^2(1 - \gamma)^2 \rho^2 / 64\}.$$

For each  $n$ -dimensional rectifiable current  $T$  of  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho,\kappa}(\zeta)$  and each  $\mathbf{C} \in \bigcup_{p=1}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned} E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho,\kappa}(\zeta)) &= \left( \frac{1}{\rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho,\kappa}(\zeta)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) \right)^{1/2}, \\ Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho,\kappa}(\zeta)) &= \left( \frac{1}{\rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho,\kappa}(\zeta)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\rho^{n+2}} \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho,\kappa/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.5.** *Given integers  $1 \leq p \leq q$  and  $\gamma, \kappa \in (0, 1)$  and  $\mu \in (1, \infty)$  there exists  $\bar{\varepsilon} = \bar{\varepsilon}(n, m, q, p, \gamma, \kappa, \mu) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\bar{\beta} = \bar{\beta}(n, m, q, p, \gamma, \kappa, \mu) \in (0, 1)$  such that the following holds true. Let  $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  and  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)$  such that*

$$(3.15) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0) = 0,$$

$$(3.16) \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \leq (q + 1/2) \mathcal{L}^n(A_{1,1}(0)),$$

$$(3.17) \quad E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) < \bar{\varepsilon},$$

and either:

- (i)  $p = 1$  or
- (ii)  $p > 1$ ,

$$(3.18) \quad E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \leq \bar{\beta} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)), \text{ and}$$

$$(3.19) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_j \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq \mu \inf_{X \in P_i \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}(X, P_j) \text{ for all } i \neq j.$$

Then:

- (a) up to reversing the orientation of  $P_i$ , there exist (possibly zero) integers  $\hat{q}_i \geq 0$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^p \hat{q}_i \leq q$  and  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable currents  $T_i$  in  $\mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0)$  such that

$$(3.20) \quad T \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0) = \sum_{i=1}^p T_i,$$

$$(3.21) \quad (\partial T_i) \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0) = 0,$$

$$(3.22) \quad (\pi_{P_i \#} T_i) \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{1,(1+\kappa)/2}(0) = \hat{q}_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{1,(1+\kappa)/2}(0),$$

$$(3.23) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_i} \text{dist}(X, P_i) \leq CE,$$

where  $E = E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, p, \gamma, \kappa, \mu) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant;

- (b) for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  with  $\hat{q}_i > 0$ , there exist a Lipschitz  $\hat{q}_i$ -valued function  $u_i : P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,\kappa}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\hat{q}_i}(P_i^\perp)$  and a closed set  $K_i \subseteq P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,\kappa}(0)$  such that

$$(3.24) \quad \begin{aligned} T_i \llcorner \pi_{P_i}^{-1}(K_i) &= (\text{graph } u_i) \llcorner \pi_{P_i}^{-1}(K_i), \\ \mathcal{H}^n(P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,\kappa}(0) \setminus K_i) + \|T_i\|(\pi_{P_i}^{-1}(P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,\kappa}(0) \setminus K_i)) &\leq CE^{2+\alpha}, \\ \sup_{P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,\kappa}(0)} |u_i| &\leq CE, \quad \sup_{P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,\kappa}(0)} |\nabla u_i| \leq CE^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$



where again  $E = E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))$  and  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $C = C(n, m, q, p, \gamma, \kappa, \mu) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants.

In Lemma 3.6, we replace hypothesis (3.18) of Lemma 3.5 with the stronger assumption (3.25), and prove that (3.19) in fact follows as a conclusion, and that the integers  $\widehat{q}_i$  (as the conclusion of Lemma 3.5) are all positive.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Given integers  $1 \leq p \leq q$  and  $\gamma, \kappa \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\bar{\varepsilon} = \bar{\varepsilon}(n, m, q, p, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\bar{\beta} = \bar{\beta}(n, m, q, p, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, 1)$  such that the following holds true. Let  $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  and  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)$  such that  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0) \neq \emptyset$  and (3.15), (3.16), and (3.17) hold true. Suppose also that either*

- (i)  $p = 1$  or
- (ii)  $p > 1$  and

$$(3.25) \quad Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \leq \bar{\beta} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)).$$

Then:

- (a) when  $p > 1$ ,

$$(3.26) \quad \text{minsep } \mathbf{C} \geq c \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)),$$

$$(3.27) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_j \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq C \inf_{X \in P_i \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}(X, P_j) \text{ for all } i \neq j,$$

where  $c = c(n, m, q, p, \gamma) > 0$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, p, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants;

- (b) up to reversing the orientation of  $P_i$ , there exist (non-zero) integers  $\widehat{q}_i > 0$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^p \widehat{q}_i \leq q$  and  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable currents  $T_i$  of  $\mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0)$  such that (3.20)–(3.23) hold true for some constant  $C = C(n, m, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, \infty)$ ;
- (c) for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  there exists Lipschitz  $\widehat{q}_i$ -valued functions  $u_i : P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,\kappa}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\widehat{q}_i}(P_i^\perp)$  and closed sets  $K_i \subseteq P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,\kappa}(0)$  such that (3.24) holds true for some constants  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, \infty)$ .

**Remark 3.7.** *Let  $U = \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)$  or  $U = \mathbf{B}_1(0)$ . There exists  $\beta = \beta(q) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $p \in \{2, 3, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ , and  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current of  $U$  such that*

$$(3.28) \quad Q(T, \mathbf{C}, U) \leq \beta \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', U)$$

(as in (3.5) and (3.25)), then

$$(3.29) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', U) \leq C \text{maxsep } \mathbf{C},$$

where  $C = 4 \|T\| (U)^{1/2}$ .

Notice that (3.6) and (3.26) are stronger conclusions than (3.29). To see (3.29), let us consider the case  $U = \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)$ . The case  $U = \mathbf{B}_1(0)$  is similar. Let  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  and let  $\mathbf{C}'_i \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p-1}$  be such that  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C}'_i = \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \setminus P_i$  (e.g. if  $i = 1$  let  $\mathbf{C}'_i = q_1 \llbracket P_2 \rrbracket + \sum_{j=2}^p q_j \llbracket P_j \rrbracket$ ). Let  $X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)$  and suppose that the closest point to  $X$  in  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C}$  lies on  $P_i$ . Since  $\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0) \subset \mathbf{B}_2(0)$ , the closest

point to  $X$  in  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C}$  lies on  $P_i \cap \mathbf{B}_2(0)$ . Thus by the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}'_i) &\leq \text{dist}(X, P_i) + \sup_{Y \in P_i \cap \mathbf{B}_2(0)} \text{dist}(Y, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}'_i) \\ &= \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) + 2 \sup_{Y \in P_i \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}(Y, \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \setminus P_i). \end{aligned}$$

If on the other hand  $X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)$  and the closest point to  $X$  in  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C}$  does not lie on  $P_i$ , then  $\text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}'_i) = \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C})$ . Hence

$$(3.30) \quad \int_{\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}'_i) d\|T\|(X) \leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) + 8 \|T\|(\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \sup_{X \in P_i \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \setminus P_i)$$

Since  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C}'_i \subset \text{spt } \mathbf{C}$ ,

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\|\mathbf{C}'_i\|(X) &= \sum_{j=1}^p |q'_j| \int_{P_j \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\mathcal{H}^n(X) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^p qq_j \int_{P_j \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\mathcal{H}^n(X) = q \int_{\mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{C}'_i = \sum_{j=1}^p q'_j \llbracket P_j \rrbracket$  for some integers  $q'_j$  with  $\sum_{j=1}^p |q'_j| = q$  and we use  $|q'_j| \leq q \leq qq_j$  for each  $j$ . Adding (3.30) and (3.31) and then using (3.28),

$$\begin{aligned} Q(T, \mathbf{C}'_i, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))^2 &\leq 2q Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))^2 + 8 \|T\|(\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \sup_{X \in P_i \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \setminus P_i) \\ &\leq 2q\beta^2 Q(T, \mathbf{C}'_i, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))^2 + 8 \|T\|(\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \sup_{X \in P_i \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \setminus P_i). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, taking  $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{q}}$  and taking the infimum over all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  gives us (3.29).

### 3.2. Proofs of the graphical representation results.

*Proof of Lemma 3.5.* Without loss of generality assume that  $\kappa \in [\kappa_0, 1)$  where  $\kappa_0 = \kappa_0(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$(3.32) \quad \mathcal{L}^n(A_{1, (1+\kappa_0)/2}(0)) \geq \frac{q+1/2}{q+3/4} \mathcal{L}^n(A_{1,1}(0)).$$

Moreover, if  $E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) = 0$ , then  $\text{spt } T \subseteq \text{spt } \mathbf{C}$  and thus the conclusion of Lemma 3.5 clearly holds true with  $T_i = T \llcorner (P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1, (3+\kappa)/4}(0))$ ,  $u_i = \widehat{q}_i \llbracket 0 \rrbracket$  and  $K_i = P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1, \kappa}(0)$  where  $\widehat{q}_i$  are integers. Hence we may assume that  $E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) > 0$ .

For  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  let  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\beta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ , and  $T_k$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)$  such that (3.15), (3.16), and (3.17) hold true with  $\varepsilon_k, \mathbf{C}_k, T_k$  in place of  $\bar{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{C}, T$  and either  $p = 1$  or  $p > 1$  and (3.18) and (3.19) hold true with  $\beta_k, \mathbf{C}_k, T_k$  in place of  $\bar{\beta}, \mathbf{C}, T$ . In view of the arbitrary choice of sequences  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$  and  $(T_k)$ , it suffices to show that conclusion (a) and (b) both hold true for infinitely many  $k$ .

By (3.15), (3.16), the Federer-Fleming compactness theorem, and [Sim83, Theorem 34.5], after passing to a subsequence there is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current  $T_\infty$  of  $\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)$  such that

$$(3.33) \quad T_k \rightarrow T_\infty \text{ weakly in } \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0).$$

By the monotonicity formula and the fact that  $\|T_k\| \rightarrow \|T_\infty\|$  as Radon measures,

$$(3.34) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,\kappa'}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T_\infty) + \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_\infty \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,\kappa'}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T_k) \rightarrow 0$$

for all  $\kappa' \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i^{(k)} \llbracket P_i^{(k)} \rrbracket$  for some integers  $q_i^{(k)} \geq 1$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^p q_i^{(k)} = q$  where  $P_i^{(k)}$  are  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes with  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset P_i^{(k)}$  and with orienting  $n$ -vector  $\vec{P}_i^{(k)}$ . After passing to a subsequence, there are integers  $q_i^{(\infty)} \geq 1$ ,  $n$ -dimensional linear planes  $P_i^{(\infty)}$ , and orientation  $n$ -vectors  $\vec{P}_i^{(\infty)}$  of  $P_i^{(\infty)}$  such that

$$(3.35) \quad q_i^{(k)} \rightarrow q_i^{(\infty)}, \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i^{(k)} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_i^{(\infty)} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \rightarrow 0, \quad \vec{P}_i^{(k)} \rightarrow \vec{P}_i^{(\infty)}$$

for each  $i$ . After possibly reversing the orientations of the planes  $P_i^{(k)}$ , we may assume that for each  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  if  $P_i^{(\infty)} = P_j^{(\infty)}$  then  $\vec{P}_i^{(\infty)} = \vec{P}_j^{(\infty)}$ . Thus

$$\mathbf{C}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_\infty = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i^{(\infty)} \llbracket P_i^{(\infty)} \rrbracket \text{ weakly in } \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0).$$

By (3.19) and (3.35),

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i^{(\infty)} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_j^{(\infty)} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq \mu \inf_{X \in P_i^{(\infty)} \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}(X, P_j^{(\infty)})$$

for each  $i \neq j$ . Thus either  $P_i^{(\infty)} = P_j^{(\infty)}$  or  $P_i^{(\infty)} \cap P_j^{(\infty)} = \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  for each  $i \neq j$ . It follows from (3.17) and monotonicity formula (as in Lemma 2.8) that for each  $\kappa' \in (0, 1)$  and sufficiently large  $k$

$$(3.36) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,\kappa'}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) \leq 2\omega_n^{\frac{-1}{n+2}} \varepsilon_k^{\frac{2}{n+2}}.$$

Letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  in (3.36) using (3.34) and (3.35) gives that  $\text{spt } T_\infty \subseteq \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_\infty$ . In particular, by the constancy theorem  $\text{spt } T_\infty$  is a union of  $n$ -dimensional planes contained in  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C}_\infty$  in  $\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)$  and  $T_\infty$  has constant multiplicity on each plane in its support.

For each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , set

$$V_i = \{X \in \mathbf{A}_{1,(15+\kappa)/16}(0) : \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } P_i^{(\infty)}) < \frac{1}{3} \text{minsep } \mathbf{C}_\infty\}.$$

Note that by (3.35),  $\mathbf{C}_k \llcorner V_i$  is a sum of finitely many  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes with integer multiplicity. By (3.15), (3.34) and  $\text{spt } T_\infty \subseteq \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_\infty$ ,  $T_k \llcorner V_i$  is a locally area minimizing rectifiable current of  $V_i$  with  $(\partial(T_k \llcorner V_i)) \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{1,(15+\kappa)/16}(0) = 0$ . By the constancy theorem, there is an integer  $\tilde{q}_i^{(k)}$  such that

$$(3.37) \quad \pi_{P_i^{(\infty)} \#} (T_k \llcorner V_i) \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{1,(7+\kappa)/8}(0) = \tilde{q}_i^{(k)} \llbracket P_i^{(\infty)} \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{1,(7+\kappa)/8}(0).$$

After possibly reversing the orientation of each plane of  $\mathbf{C}_k$  converging to  $P_i^{(\infty)}$ , we may assume that  $\tilde{q}_i^{(k)} \geq 0$ . By (3.16) and (3.32)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{q}_i^{(k)} \mathcal{L}^n(A_{1,(7+\kappa)/8}(0)) &\leq \|T_k\| (V_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,(7+\kappa)/8}(0)) \leq \|T_k\| (\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \\ &\leq (q + 1/2) \mathcal{L}^n(A_{1,1}(0)) \leq (q + 3/4) \mathcal{L}^n(A_{1,(7+\kappa)/8}(0)) \end{aligned}$$

and thus  $\tilde{q}_i^{(k)} \leq q$ . By (3.34) and Lemma 2.11,  $\int_{V_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,(7+\kappa)/8}(0)} |\vec{T}_k - \vec{P}_i^{(\infty)}|^2 d\|T_k\| \rightarrow 0$ , where  $\vec{T}_k$  is the orientation  $n$ -vector of  $T_k$ . In view of these facts as well as (3.35) and (3.19), we can apply

Theorem 2.15 with  $P_i^{(\infty)}$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k \llcorner V_i$  and  $T_k \llcorner V_i$  in place of  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}$ ,  $\mathbf{P}$  and  $T$  to obtain

$$\sup_{\text{spt } T_k \cap V_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k \cap V_i) \leq CE(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma, \kappa, \mu) \in (0, \infty)$ . In other words,

$$(3.38) \quad \sup_{\text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) \leq CE(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma, \kappa, \mu) \in (0, \infty)$ . Recall that  $\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i^{(k)} \llbracket P_i^{(k)} \rrbracket$ . Let

$$\{X \in \mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0) : \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } P_i^{(k)}) < 2CE(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_k} U_i^{(k)}$$

as a union of connected components  $U_i^{(k)}$ , where  $C$  is as in (3.38). Thus  $U_i^{(k)}$  are mutually disjoint, connected, open subsets of  $\mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0)$ . For each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N_k\}$ , select a plane  $P_{j(i)}^{(k)}$  of  $\mathbf{C}_k$  such that  $P_{j(i)}^{(k)} \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0) \subset U_i^{(k)}$ . After passing to a subsequence we can take  $N = N_k$  to be independent of  $k$  and assume that  $j(i)$  is independent of  $k$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . Set

$$T_{j(i)}^{(k)} = T_k \llcorner U_i^{(k)}$$

for each  $k$  and each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . Set  $T_j^{(k)} = 0$  if  $j \notin \{j(1), j(2), \dots, j(N)\}$ . Clearly (3.20) and (3.21) hold true with  $T_k$  and  $T_i^{(k)}$  in place of  $T$  and  $T_i$ . By the above construction,

$$\sup_{\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) \leq 4qCE(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))$$

where  $C$  is as in (3.38), proving (3.23) with  $\mathbf{C}_k, P_i^{(k)}, T_k, T_i^{(k)}$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}, P_i, T, T_i$ . By the constancy theorem there exists integers  $\widehat{q}_i^{(k)}$  such that (3.22) holds true with  $\widehat{q}_i^{(k)}, P_i^{(k)}, T_i^{(k)}$  in place of  $\widehat{q}_i, P_i, T_i$ . Since (3.37) holds true with  $\widehat{q}_i^{(k)} \geq 0$ , by Lemma 2.7 and the continuity of push-forwards in the weak topology we have that  $\widehat{q}_i^{(k)} \geq 0$  for all  $k$  and  $i$ . By (3.22), (3.20), (3.16), and (3.32),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^p \widehat{q}_i^{(k)} \mathcal{L}^n(A_{1,(1+\kappa)/2}(0)) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^p \|T_i^{(k)}\|(\mathbf{A}_{1,(1+\kappa)/2}(0)) = \|T_k\|(\mathbf{A}_{1,(1+\kappa)/2}(0)) \\ &\leq (q + 1/2) \mathcal{L}^n(A_{1,1}(0)) \leq (q + 3/4) \mathcal{L}^n(A_{1,(1+\kappa)/2}(0)) \end{aligned}$$

and thus  $\sum_{i=1}^p \widehat{q}_i^{(k)} \leq q$ . Therefore, Lemma 3.5(a) holds true. By applying Almgren's Strong Lipschitz Approximation Theorem (Theorem 2.9) using a partition of unity argument (see the proof of Lemma 2.9 of [KrumWic-a]) and Lemma 2.11, Lemma 3.5(b) holds true.  $\square$

The proof of Lemma 3.6 will proceed by induction on  $p$ , assuming for  $p_0 \in \{2, 3, \dots, q\}$  that

(H5) Lemma 3.6 holds true for all  $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, p_0 - 1\}$ .

Before proceeding with the proof of Lemma 3.6 we observe the following.

**Remark 3.8.** (1) Let  $\widetilde{\beta} \in (0, 1)$  be an arbitrary constant. Suppose that  $2 \leq p_0 \leq q$ ,  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p_0}$ , and  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)$ . Choose an integer  $\widetilde{p} \in \{1, 2, \dots, p_0 - 1\}$  such that

$$\inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^k \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \geq \frac{\widetilde{\beta}}{2} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{k-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))$$

whenever  $k \in \{\tilde{p} + 1, \tilde{p} + 2, \dots, p_0 - 1\}$ , and such that either  $\tilde{p} = 1$  or  $\tilde{p} > 1$  and

$$\inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{\tilde{p}} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) < \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{2} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{\tilde{p}-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)).$$

Choose  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,\tilde{p}}$  such that

$$Q(T, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \leq 2 \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{\tilde{p}} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)).$$

Hence we choose  $\tilde{p} \in \{1, 2, \dots, p_0 - 1\}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,\tilde{p}}$  which satisfy

$$(3.39) \quad Q(T, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \leq 2^{p_0-1} \tilde{\beta}^{2-p_0} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)),$$

and either  $\tilde{p} = 1$  or  $\tilde{p} > 1$  and

$$(3.40) \quad Q(T, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \leq \tilde{\beta} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{\tilde{p}-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))$$

(as in (3.25) with  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}$ ).

(2) Suppose that (H5) holds true and  $T$  satisfies hypotheses of Lemma 3.6. Let  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\tilde{\beta} = \tilde{\beta}(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  be suitably small constants and suppose that

$$(3.41) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) < \delta.$$

Let  $\tilde{p} \in \{1, 2, \dots, p_0 - 1\}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,\tilde{p}}$  such that (3.39) holds true and either  $\tilde{p} = 1$  or  $\tilde{p} > 1$  and (3.40) holds true. Let  $\text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{P}_i$  for  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes  $\tilde{P}_i$  such that  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset \tilde{P}_i$ . By (H5), (3.15), (3.16), (3.39), (3.40), and (3.41) we can apply Lemma 3.6 with  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}$  to deduce the following. By Lemma 3.6(a) either  $\tilde{p} = 1$  or  $\tilde{p} > 1$  and

$$(3.42) \quad \text{minsep } \tilde{\mathbf{C}} \geq c \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{\tilde{p}-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)),$$

$$(3.43) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\tilde{P}_i \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \tilde{P}_{i'} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq C \inf_{X \in \tilde{P}_i \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}(X, \tilde{P}_{i'}) \text{ for all } 1 \leq i, i' \leq \tilde{p}$$

for some constants  $c = c(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) > 0$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . By Lemma 3.6(b), there exists integers  $\tilde{q}_i > 0$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{q}_i \leq q$  and  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable currents  $\tilde{T}_i$  of  $\mathbf{A}_{1,(15+\kappa)/16}(0)$  such that

$$(3.44) \quad T \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{1,(15+\kappa)/16}(0) = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{T}_i,$$

$$(3.45) \quad (\partial \tilde{T}_i) \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{1,(15+\kappa)/16}(0) = 0,$$

$$(3.46) \quad (\pi_{\tilde{P}_i \#} \tilde{T}_i) \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{1,(7+\kappa)/8}(0) = \tilde{q}_i \llcorner [\tilde{P}_i] \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{1,(7+\kappa)/8}(0),$$

$$(3.47) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } \tilde{T}_i} \text{dist}(X, \tilde{P}_i) \leq C \tilde{Q},$$

where  $\tilde{Q} = Q(T, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. By Lemma 3.6(c), for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \tilde{p}\}$  there exist a Lipschitz  $\tilde{q}_i$ -valued function  $\tilde{u}_i : \tilde{P}_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{q}_i}(\tilde{P}_i^\perp)$

and a closed set  $\tilde{K}_i \subseteq \tilde{P}_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0)$  such that

$$(3.48) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_i \llcorner \pi_{\tilde{P}_i}^{-1}(\tilde{K}_i) &= (\text{graph } \tilde{u}_i) \llcorner \pi_{\tilde{P}_i}^{-1}(\tilde{K}_i), \\ \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{P}_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0) \setminus \tilde{K}_i) + \|\tilde{T}_i\|(\pi_{\tilde{P}_i}^{-1}(\tilde{P}_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0) \setminus \tilde{K}_i)) &\leq C\tilde{Q}^{2+\alpha}, \\ \sup_{\tilde{P}_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0)} |\tilde{u}_i| &\leq C\tilde{Q}, \quad \sup_{\tilde{P}_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,(3+\kappa)/4}(0)} |\nabla \tilde{u}_i| \leq C\tilde{Q}^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where and  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants.

(3) Suppose that  $\tilde{T}_i$  are as in (3.44)–(3.47) with  $\kappa = 1/2$  and  $\tilde{u}_i$  are as in (3.48) with  $\kappa = 1/2$ . Let  $X \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)$ . By (3.39), (3.41) and (3.47),  $\text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T) < (1 - \gamma)/32$ . Thus the closest point to  $X$  in  $\text{spt } T$  lies in  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,3/4}(0)$ . In other words, by (3.44), the closest point to  $X$  in  $\text{spt } T$  lies on  $\text{spt } \tilde{T}_i$  for some  $i$ . By the triangle inequality and (3.47),

$$(3.49) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}) &\leq \text{dist}(X, \tilde{P}_i) \leq \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \tilde{T}_i) + \sup_{Y \in \text{spt } \tilde{T}_i} \text{dist}(X, \tilde{P}_i) \\ &\leq \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T) + C\tilde{Q}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Integrating (3.49) over  $X \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)$  and using (3.16) and (3.25),

$$(3.50) \quad \int_{\mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) + C\tilde{Q}^2 \leq C\tilde{Q}^2,$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. On the other hand, by the triangle inequality and (3.48)

$$(3.51) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) &\leq \text{dist}(X + \tilde{u}_{i,j}(X), \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) + |\tilde{u}_{i,j}(X)| \\ &\leq \text{dist}(X + \tilde{u}_{i,j}(X), \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) + C\tilde{Q} \end{aligned}$$

for each  $X \in \tilde{P}_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1/2,1}(0)$  and  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \tilde{q}_i\}$ , where  $\tilde{u}_i(X) = \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{q}_i} \llbracket \tilde{u}_{i,j}(X) \rrbracket$  for some  $\tilde{u}_{i,j}(X) \in \tilde{P}_i^\perp$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Integrating (3.51) over  $X \in \tilde{P}_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1/2,1}(0)$  and using the area formula, (3.48), and (3.25)

$$(3.52) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{q}_i \int_{\tilde{P}_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1/2,1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\mathcal{H}^n(X) \\ \leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{A}_{3/4,1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) + C\tilde{Q}^2 \leq C\tilde{Q}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,\tilde{p}}$ , it follows from (3.50) and (3.52) that

$$(3.53) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq C\tilde{Q}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

(4) By (3.40) and (3.42),  $Q(T, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \leq C\tilde{\beta} \text{minsep } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}$  for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . (Recall that if  $\tilde{p} = 1$  then  $\text{minsep } \tilde{\mathbf{C}} = \infty$ .) Thus assuming  $\tilde{\beta}$  is sufficient small, by (3.53)

$$(3.54) \quad \mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} q_{i,j} \llbracket P_{i,j} \rrbracket$$

for some integers  $s_i \geq 1$  and  $q_{i,j} \geq 1$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} s_i = p_0$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} q_{i,j} = q$  and some distinct  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes  $P_{i,j}$  such that  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset P_{i,j}$  and

$$(3.55) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_{i,j} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \tilde{P}_i \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq C Q(T, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)),$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. In light of (3.55) we may assume (by reversing the orientation of  $\tilde{P}_i$  if necessary) that the orientation of  $P_{i,j}$  is close to the orientation of  $\tilde{P}_i$  as  $n$ -vectors. When  $\tilde{p} > 1$ , since  $p_0 > \tilde{p}$ , there exists  $i$  and  $j \neq j'$  such that  $P_{i,j}$  and  $P_{i,j'}$  are distinct planes close to  $\tilde{P}_i$  and thus by (3.55)

$$(3.56) \quad \text{maxsep } \mathbf{C} \leq C Q(T, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.6.* We shall proceed by induction on  $p$ . Let  $\gamma, \kappa \in (0, 1)$ . Let us look at the base case  $p = 1$ . For  $p = 1$  we do not need to prove Lemma 3.6(a). By (3.15), (3.16), and (3.17) we can apply Lemma 2.19 and Almgren's Strong Lipschitz Approximation Theorem (Theorem 2.9) to obtain Lemma 3.6(b)(c) provided we also show that  $\hat{q}_1 > 0$ . (In particular, Lemma 3.6(b) holds true with  $T_1 = T \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{1, (3+\kappa)/4}(0)$ .) By (3.23), (3.17), and Lemma 2.11,  $\int_{\mathbf{A}_{1, (1+\kappa)/2}(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}_1|^2 d\|T\|(X) \leq C\bar{\varepsilon}^2$ , where  $\vec{T}$  is the orientation  $n$ -vector of  $T$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Thus since we assumed  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0) \neq \emptyset$ , by Lemma 2.6 we must have that  $\hat{q}_1 > 0$ .

Suppose now that  $p_0 \in \{2, 3, \dots, q\}$  and (H5) holds. We want to show Lemma 3.6 holds true when  $p = p_0$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.6(a).* Let  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 3.6. We will prove Lemma 3.6(a) by separately considering the cases

$$(I) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) < \delta;$$

$$(II) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \geq \delta;$$

where  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  will be chosen so that Lemma 3.6(a) holds true in Case (I).

*Case (I).* Fix  $\tilde{\beta} = \tilde{\beta}(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, 1)$  are small enough that we can apply Remark 3.8(2)(3)(4). By Remark 3.8(1), there exists  $1 \leq \tilde{p} < p_0$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathcal{C}_{q, \tilde{p}}$  such that (3.39) holds true and either  $\tilde{p} = 1$  or  $\tilde{p} > 1$  and (3.40) holds true. Let  $\text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{P}_i$  for  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes  $\tilde{P}_i$  such that  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset \tilde{P}_i$ .

It suffices to first show (3.26). Then (3.27) will follow by observing that by (3.26), (3.39), and (3.55)

$$(3.57) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_{i,j} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_{i,j'} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq C \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0))$$

$$\leq C \text{minsep } \mathbf{C} \leq C \inf_{X \in P_{i,j} \cap (\mathbf{S}^{m-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}(X, P_{i,j'})$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq p$  and  $j \neq j'$ . Moreover, by (3.55), (3.40) and (3.42) we have  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_{i,j} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \tilde{P}_i \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq C\tilde{\beta} \text{minsep } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ , which together with (3.43) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_{i,j} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_{i',j'} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) &\leq 2 \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\tilde{P}_i \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \tilde{P}_{i'} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \\ &\leq 2C \inf_{X \in \tilde{P}_i \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}(X, \tilde{P}_{i'}) \\ &\leq 4C \inf_{X \in P_{i,j} \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}(X, P_{i',j'}) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $i \neq i'$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq s_i$ , and  $1 \leq j' \leq s_{i'}$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant; this together with (3.57) proves (3.27).

We claim that provided  $\delta$  is sufficiently small, (3.26) holds true. Suppose to the contrary that for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  there are  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\beta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p_0}$ , and  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable currents  $T_k$  of  $\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)$  such that (3.15), (3.16), (3.17), and (3.25) hold true with  $\varepsilon_k, \beta_k, \mathbf{C}_k, T_k$  in place of  $\bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{\beta}, \mathbf{C}, T$  and

$$(3.58) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) < \delta_k$$

but

$$(3.59) \quad \text{minsep } \mathbf{C}_k \leq \frac{1}{k} Q(T, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)).$$

Let  $1 \leq \tilde{p} < p$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,\tilde{p}}$  such that (3.39) holds true with  $\delta_k, T_k, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  in place of  $\delta, T, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}$  and either  $\tilde{p} = 1$  or  $\tilde{p} > 1$  and (3.40) holds true with  $T_k$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  in place of  $T$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ . Note that after passing to a subsequence we assume that  $\tilde{p}$  is independent of  $k$ . Let

$$\text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{P}_i^{(k)}$$

for some distinct  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes  $\tilde{P}_i^{(k)}$  such that  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset \tilde{P}_i^{(k)}$ . Recall that there exists integers  $\tilde{q}_i$  and  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable currents  $\tilde{T}_i^{(k)}$  such that

$$T_k \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{1,31/32}(0) = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{T}_i^{(k)}$$

(as in (3.44)) and (3.45)–(3.47) hold true with  $\kappa = 1/2$  and with  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k, \tilde{P}_i^{(k)}, T_k, \tilde{T}_i^{(k)}$  in place of  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}, \tilde{P}_i, T, \tilde{T}_i$ . Again, after passing to a subsequence we assume that  $\tilde{q}_i$  are independent of  $k$ . Further recall that there exists Lipschitz  $\tilde{q}_i$ -valued functions  $\tilde{u}_i^{(k)} : \tilde{P}_i^{(k)} \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{q}_i}((\tilde{P}_i^{(k)})^\perp)$  and sets  $\tilde{K}_i^{(k)} \subseteq \tilde{P}_i^{(k)} \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)$  such that

$$(3.60) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_i^{(k)} \llcorner \pi_{\tilde{P}_i^{(k)}}^{-1}(\tilde{K}_i^{(k)}) &= (\text{graph } \tilde{u}_i^{(k)}) \llcorner \pi_{\tilde{P}_i^{(k)}}^{-1}(\tilde{K}_i^{(k)}), \\ \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{P}_i^{(k)} \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0) \setminus \tilde{K}_i^{(k)}) &+ \|\tilde{T}_i^{(k)}\|(\pi_{\tilde{P}_i^{(k)}}^{-1}(\tilde{P}_i^{(k)}) \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0) \setminus \tilde{K}_i^{(k)}) \leq C\tilde{Q}_k^{2+\alpha}, \\ \sup_{\tilde{P}_i^{(k)} \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)} |\tilde{u}_i^{(k)}| &\leq C\tilde{Q}_k, \quad \text{Lip } \tilde{u}_i^{(k)} \leq C\tilde{Q}_k^\alpha \end{aligned}$$



(as in (3.48)), where  $\tilde{Q}_k = Q(T_k, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))$  and where  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Express  $\mathbf{C}_k$  as

$$\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} q_{i,j} \llbracket P_{i,j}^{(k)} \rrbracket$$

(as in (3.54)) where  $s_i \geq 1$  and  $q_{i,j} \geq 1$  are integers with  $\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} s_i = p_0$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} q_{i,j} = q$  and  $P_{i,j}^{(k)}$  are distinct  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes such that  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset P_{i,j}^{(k)}$  and (3.55) holds true with  $\tilde{P}_i^{(k)}, P_{i,j}^{(k)}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k, T_k$  in place of  $\tilde{P}_i, P_{i,j}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}, T$ . After passing to a subsequence we assume that  $s_i$  and  $q_{i,j}$  are independent of  $k$ . By (3.55), each  $P_{i,j}^{(k)}$  is the graph of a linear single-valued function  $\phi_{i,j}^{(k)} : \tilde{P}_i^{(k)} \rightarrow (\tilde{P}_i^{(k)})^\perp$  such that

$$(3.61) \quad \|\phi_{i,j}^{(k)}\|_{L^\infty(B_1(0, \tilde{P}_i^{(k)}))} \leq C\tilde{Q}_k$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . For each  $k$  and  $i$ , set  $\phi_i^{(k)} = \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} q_{i,j} \llbracket \phi_{i,j}^{(k)} \rrbracket$  as a multi-valued function.

Let  $\mathbf{q}_i^{(k)} : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  be an orthogonal linear transformation such that  $\mathbf{q}_i^{(k)}(\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}) = \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  and  $\mathbf{q}_i^{(k)}(\tilde{P}_i^{(k)}) = \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . It follows that  $\mathbf{q}_i^{(k)}((\tilde{P}_i^{(k)})^\perp) = \mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}$ . By the area formula and (3.60),

$$\int_{\tilde{P}_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)} |D\tilde{u}_i^{(k)}|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{A}_{1,5/8}(0)} |\vec{T}_i^{(k)} - \vec{P}_i^{(k)}|^2 d\|\vec{T}_i^{(k)}\| + C\tilde{Q}_k^{2+\alpha} \leq C\tilde{Q}_k^2,$$

where  $\vec{T}_i^{(k)}$  and  $\vec{P}_i^{(k)}$  are the orientation  $n$ -vectors of  $\tilde{T}_i^{(k)}$  and  $\tilde{P}_i^{(k)}$  respectively and where  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Thus by [Alm83, Theorem 2.19] (or [DelSpa11, Proposition 2.11 and Proposition 3.20]) after passing to a subsequence there is a locally Dirichlet energy minimizing  $\tilde{q}_i$ -valued function  $w_i \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0), \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{q}_i}(\mathbb{R}^m))$  such that  $(\mathbf{q}_i^{(k)} \circ \tilde{u}_i^{(k)} \circ (\mathbf{q}_i^{(k)})^{-1})/E_k \rightarrow w_i$  in  $L^2(\mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0), \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{q}_i}(\mathbb{R}^m))$ . By (3.61), after passing to a subsequence there are linear single-valued functions  $\psi_{i,j} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $(\mathbf{q}_i^{(k)} \circ \phi_{i,j}^{(k)} \circ (\mathbf{q}_i^{(k)})^{-1})/\tilde{Q}_k \rightarrow \psi_{i,j}$  uniformly on  $B_1(0)$ . For each  $i$ , set  $\psi_i = \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} q_{i,j} \llbracket \psi_{i,j} \rrbracket$  as a multi-valued function such that  $(\mathbf{q}_i^{(k)} \circ \phi_i^{(k)} \circ (\mathbf{q}_i^{(k)})^{-1})/\tilde{Q}_k \rightarrow \psi_i$  uniformly on  $\mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)$ .

For each  $X \in \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)$  let  $\tilde{u}_i^{(k)}(X) = \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{q}_i} \llbracket \tilde{u}_{i,j}^{(k)}(X) \rrbracket$  for some  $\tilde{u}_{i,j}^{(k)}(X) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Let  $\text{spt } \tilde{u}_i^{(k)}(X) = \{\tilde{u}_{i,1}^{(k)}(X), \dots, \tilde{u}_{i,\tilde{q}_i}^{(k)}(X)\}$  be the set of all values of  $\tilde{u}_i^{(k)}(X)$  and similarly let  $\text{spt } \phi_i^{(k)}(X)$ ,  $\text{spt } w_i(X)$ , and  $\text{spt } \psi_i(X)$  denote the set of all values of  $\phi_i^{(k)}(X)$ ,  $w_i(X)$ , and  $\psi_i(X)$  respectively. Since by (3.61)  $|\nabla \phi_{i,j}^{(k)}| \leq CE$  is small,

$$\text{dist}(\tilde{u}_{i,j}^{(k)}(X), \text{spt } \phi_i^{(k)}(X)) \leq 2 \text{dist}(X + \tilde{u}_{i,j}^{(k)}(X), \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k)$$

for each  $X \in \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)$  and sufficiently large  $k$ . Thus by the area formula, (3.60), and (3.25),

$$(3.62) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \int_{\tilde{P}_i^{(k)} \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{q}_i} \text{dist}^2(\tilde{u}_{i,j}^{(k)}(X), \text{spt } \phi_i^{(k)}(X)) d\mathcal{H}^n(X) \\ & \leq 4 \int_{\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|T_k\|(X) + C\tilde{Q}_k^{2+\alpha} \\ & \leq 4\beta_k^2 \tilde{Q}_k^2 + C\tilde{Q}_k^{2+\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Dividing (3.62) by  $\tilde{Q}_k^2$  and letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  gives us that  $\text{spt } w_i(X) \subseteq \text{spt } \psi_i(X)$  for  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $X \in A_{1,1/2}(0)$ . On the other hand, by a similar argument (3.60) and (3.25) also give us

$$(3.63) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} q_{i,j} \int_{\tilde{P}_i^{(k)} \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(\phi_{i,j}^{(k)}(X), \text{spt } \tilde{u}_i^{(k)}(X)) d\mathcal{H}^n(X) \leq 4\beta_k^2 \tilde{Q}_k^2 + C\tilde{Q}_k^{2+\alpha},$$

where  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Dividing (3.63) by  $\tilde{Q}_k^2$  and letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  gives us  $\text{spt } w_i(X) = \text{spt } \psi_i(X)$  for  $\mathcal{L}^n$ -a.e.  $X \in A_{1,1/2}(0)$ . In fact since  $w_i$  is Dirichlet energy minimizing and therefore continuous in  $A_{1,1/2}(0)$ ,  $\text{spt } w_i(X) = \text{spt } \psi_i(X)$  for all  $X \in A_{1,1/2}(0)$ .

By (3.16) and (3.40) we can apply Remark 3.7 to obtain

$$\text{maxsep } \mathbf{C}_k \geq c \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}}$$

where  $c = c(n, m, q, \gamma) > 0$  is a constant and the last step follows from (3.39). Hence, since each  $P_{i,j}^{(k)}$  is graph of a linear single-valued  $\phi_{i,j}^{(k)}$ ,

$$(3.64) \quad \sup_{X \in \tilde{P}_i^{(k)} \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} |\phi_{i,j}^{(k)}(X) - \phi_{i,j'}^{(k)}(X)| \geq c\tilde{Q}_k$$

for all  $k$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , and  $1 \leq j < j' \leq s_i$  and for some constant  $c = c(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) > 0$ . Dividing (3.64) by  $\tilde{Q}_k$  and letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  gives us that  $\psi_{i,j} \neq \psi_{i,j'}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq p$  and  $1 \leq j < j' \leq s_i$ . Similarly, by (3.59) for each sufficiently large  $k$  there exists  $1 \leq i \leq p$  and  $1 \leq j < j' \leq s_i$  such that

$$(3.65) \quad \inf_{X \in \tilde{P}_i^{(k)} \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} |\phi_{i,j}^{(k)}(X) - \phi_{i,j'}^{(k)}(X)| \leq \frac{2}{k} \tilde{Q}_k.$$

After passing to a subsequence, we may take  $i$ ,  $j$ , and  $j'$  to be independent of  $k$ . Dividing (3.65) by  $\tilde{Q}_k$  and letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  gives us that  $\psi_{i,j}(X) = \psi_{i,j'}(X)$  for some  $X \in \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Hence since  $\psi_{i,j} = \psi_{i,j'} = 0$  on  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ ,  $\{\psi_{i,j} = \psi_{i,j'}\}$  is an  $(n-1)$ -dimensional linear subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Since  $\text{spt } w_i(X) = \text{spt } \psi_i(X)$  for all  $X \in A_{1,1/2}(0)$ , the singular set of  $w_i$  contains the  $(n-1)$ -dimensional linear subspace  $\{\psi_{i,j} = \psi_{i,j'}\}$ , contradicting  $w_i$  being Dirichlet energy minimizing. Therefore, (3.26) holds true.

*Case (II).* Now fix  $\delta$  such that Lemma 3.6(a) holds true in Case (I). Let's show that provided  $\bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{\beta}$  are sufficiently small,

$$(3.66) \quad \text{minsep } \mathbf{C} \geq c$$

for some constant  $c = c(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$ . Since

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_j \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq 2$$

for each pair  $P_i$  and  $P_j$  of planes of  $\mathbf{C}$  and by (3.16)

$$(3.67) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \leq C$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ , showing (3.66) will prove Lemma 3.6(a). Note that by Remark 3.7,

$$(3.68) \quad \text{maxsep } \mathbf{C} \geq c\delta$$

for some constant  $c = c(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) > 0$ .

To see (3.66), suppose to the contrary that for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  there are  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\beta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ , and  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable currents  $T_k$  of  $\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)$  such that (3.15), (3.16), (3.17), and (3.25) hold true with  $\varepsilon_k, \beta_k, \mathbf{C}_k, T_k$  in place of  $\bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{\beta}, \mathbf{C}, T$  and

$$(3.69) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \geq \delta$$

but

$$(3.70) \quad \text{minsep } \mathbf{C}_k \leq \frac{1}{k}.$$

By (3.15), (3.16), the Federer-Fleming compactness theorem, and [Sim83, Theorem 34.5], after passing to a subsequence there is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current  $T_\infty$  such that

$$T_k \rightarrow T_\infty \text{ weakly in } \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0).$$

In particular, by [Sim83, Theorem 34.5] and the monotonicity formula,

$$(3.71) \quad \|T_k\| \rightarrow \|T_\infty\| \text{ in the sense of Radon measures of } \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0),$$

$$(3.72) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,3/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T_\infty) + \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_\infty \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,3/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T_k) \rightarrow 0.$$

Let  $\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i^{(k)} \llbracket P_i^{(k)} \rrbracket$  for some integers  $q_i^{(k)} \geq 1$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^p q_i^{(k)} = q$  and  $P_i^{(k)}$  are  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes with  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset P_i^{(k)}$  and with orienting  $n$ -vector  $\vec{P}_i^{(k)}$ . After passing to a subsequence there are integers  $q_i^{(\infty)} \geq 1$ ,  $n$ -dimensional linear planes  $P_i^{(\infty)}$ , and orienting  $n$ -vectors  $\vec{P}_i^{(\infty)}$  or  $P_i^{(\infty)}$  such that

$$(3.73) \quad q_i^{(k)} \rightarrow q_i^{(\infty)}, \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i^{(k)} \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0), P_i^{(\infty)} \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \rightarrow 0, \quad \vec{P}_i^{(k)} \rightarrow \vec{P}_i^{(\infty)}$$

for each  $i$ , and thus

$$\mathbf{C}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_\infty = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i^{(\infty)} \llbracket P_i^{(\infty)} \rrbracket \text{ weakly in } \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0).$$

Note that by (3.68) and (3.73),  $\text{maxsep } \mathbf{C}_\infty \geq c\delta$  (where  $c$  is as in (3.68)) and thus  $\mathbf{C}_\infty$  consists of  $p$  distinct planes  $P_i^{(\infty)}$ . In particular,  $\mathbf{C}_\infty \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ . By (3.25), (3.67), and the monotonicity formula, for all  $\kappa' \in (0, 1)$  and sufficiently large  $k$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) + \sup_{X \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/4}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T_k) \\ & \leq CQ(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))^{\frac{2}{n+2}} \leq C\beta_k^{\frac{2}{n+2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  using (3.72) and (3.73)

$$(3.74) \quad \text{spt } T_\infty \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/4}(0) = \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_\infty \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/4}(0).$$

But by (3.70) and (3.73), at least two distinct planes of  $P_i^{(\infty)}$  and  $P_j^{(\infty)}$  of  $\mathbf{C}_\infty$  intersect in  $\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Recalling  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  is a subspace of both  $P_i^{(\infty)}$  and  $P_j^{(\infty)}$ ,  $P_i^{(\infty)}$  and  $P_j^{(\infty)}$  intersect along an  $(n-1)$ -dimensional linear subspace. Hence by (3.74),  $\text{spt } T_\infty \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,1/2}(0)$  is a union of  $n$ -dimensional planes, with two distinct planes intersecting along an  $(n-1)$ -dimensional linear subspace, contradicting  $T_\infty$  being area-minimizing in  $\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)$ . Therefore, (3.66) must hold true.

*Proof of Lemma 3.6(b) and (c).* In light of (3.27), we can apply Lemma 3.5(a) to obtain

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{A}_{1,(1+\kappa)/2}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) \leq CE(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0))$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, \infty)$ . In particular, by (3.25) and (3.26)

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{A}_{1, (1+\kappa)/2}(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) \leq C\bar{\beta} \text{sep } \mathbf{C}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, \infty)$ . Therefore, assuming  $\bar{\beta}$  is sufficiently small and possibly reversing the orientation of  $P_i$ , there exists integers  $\hat{q}_i \geq 0$  and  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable currents  $T_i$  of  $\mathbf{A}_{1, (3+\kappa)/4}(0)$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^{p_0} \hat{q}_i \leq q$  and (3.20), (3.21) and (3.22) hold true. By Lemma 2.19, (3.23) holds true with  $C = C(n, m, \gamma, \kappa)$ . To complete the proof of Lemma 3.6(b), it remains to show that  $\hat{q}_i > 0$ . Then by applying Almgren's Strong Lipschitz Approximation Theorem (Theorem 2.9) like in Lemma 3.5(b), Lemma 3.6(c) holds true.

Suppose that  $\hat{q}_i = 0$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p_0\}$ . By (3.23), (3.17), and Lemma 2.11, we have that  $\int_{\mathbf{A}_{1, (1+\kappa)/2}(0)} |\vec{T} - \vec{P}_i|^2 d\|T\|(X) \leq C\bar{\varepsilon}^2$ , where  $\vec{T}$  is the orientation  $n$ -vector of  $T$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Hence by Lemma 2.6,  $\text{spt } T_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1, (3+5\kappa)/8}(0) = \emptyset$ . We claim that for each  $X \in P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1, 1/4}(0)$

$$(3.75) \quad \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T) \geq c \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q, p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1, 1}(0))$$

for some constant  $c = c(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma, \kappa) > 0$ . In the case that  $\text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T) \geq (1 - \gamma)/64$ , (3.75) obviously holds true. If  $\text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T) < (1 - \gamma)/64$ , then by the triangle inequality,  $\text{spt } T_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1, 3/8}(0) = \emptyset$ , (3.26), (3.23), and (3.25)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T) &\geq \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \setminus P_i) - \sup_{Y \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{A}_{1, 3/8}(0)} \text{dist}(Y, \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \setminus P_i) \\ &= \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \setminus P_i) - \sup_{Y \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{A}_{1, 3/8}(0)} \text{dist}(Y, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) \\ &\geq c \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q, p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1, 1}(0)) - C E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{1, 1}(0)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} c \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q, p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1, 1}(0)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $c = c(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma, \kappa) > 0$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma, \kappa) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Integrating (3.75) over  $X \in P_i$ ,

$$Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{1, 1}(0))^2 \geq \int_{P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1, 1/4}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\mathcal{H}^n(X) \geq c \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q, p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1, 1}(0))^2$$

for some constant  $c = c(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma, \kappa) > 0$ , contradicting (3.25).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.4.* Suppose that  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \mathbf{C}, T$  satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 3.4. Take any  $\rho \geq \tau/4$  and  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  such that  $\rho^2 + |\zeta|^2 \leq (3 + \gamma)^2/16$ . We claim that

$$(3.76) \quad (\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta) = 0,$$

$$(3.77) \quad E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)) \leq \rho^{-(n+2)/2} E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < (\tau/4)^{-(n+2)/2} \varepsilon_0,$$

$$(3.78) \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta)) > (q - 1/2) \mathcal{L}^n(A_{\rho, 1/2}(0)),$$

$$(3.79) \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)) < (q + 1/2) \mathcal{L}^n(A_{\rho, 1}(0)),$$

$$(3.80) \quad E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)) \leq C\tau^{-(n+2)/2} \beta_0 \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q, p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)),$$

where  $C = C(n, m, p, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Moreover, we claim that

$$(3.81) \quad Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{1/4,1}(0)) \leq C\tau^{-(n+2)/2}\beta_0 \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1/4,1}(0))$$

where again  $C = C(n, m, p, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Since  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho,1}(\zeta) \subset \mathbf{B}_1(0)$ , (3.76) follows directly from  $(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0$  and (3.77) follows from (3.4).

Let us show (3.78) holds true. Note that the proof of (3.79) is similar. Suppose to the contrary that for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  there exists  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ , and  $T_k$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  such that (3.3) and (3.4) hold true with  $\varepsilon_k, \mathbf{C}_k, T_k$  in place of  $\varepsilon_0, \mathbf{C}, T$  but for some  $\rho_k \geq \tau/4$  and  $\zeta_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  with  $\rho_k^2 + |\zeta_k|^2 \leq (3 + \gamma)^2/16$

$$(3.82) \quad \|T_k\|(\mathbf{A}_{\rho_k,1/2}(\zeta_k)) \leq (q - 1/2) \mathcal{L}^n(\mathbf{A}_{\rho_k,1/2}(0)).$$

By (3.3), the Federer-Fleming compactness theorem, and [Sim83, Theorem 34.5], after passing to a subsequence there exists an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current  $T_\infty$  of  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  such that

$$(3.83) \quad \begin{aligned} T_k &\rightarrow T_\infty \text{ weakly in } \mathbf{B}_1(0), \\ \|T_k\| &\rightarrow \|T_\infty\| \text{ in the sense of Radon measures of } \mathbf{B}_1(0). \end{aligned}$$

By the monotonicity formula,

$$(3.84) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_\infty \cap \mathbf{B}_\sigma(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T_k) \rightarrow 0$$

for all  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i^{(k)} \llbracket P_i^{(k)} \rrbracket$  for some integers  $q_i^{(k)} \geq 1$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^p q_i^{(k)} = q$  and for some  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes  $P_i^{(k)}$  with  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset P_i^{(k)}$  and with orientation  $n$ -vectors  $\vec{P}_i^{(k)}$ . After passing to a subsequence, there are integers  $q_i^{(\infty)}$  and  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes  $P_i^{(\infty)}$  with  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset P_i^{(\infty)}$  and with orientation  $n$ -vectors  $\vec{P}_i^{(\infty)}$  such that

$$(3.85) \quad q_i^{(k)} \rightarrow q_i^{(\infty)}, \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i^{(k)} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_i^{(\infty)} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \rightarrow 0, \quad \vec{P}_i^{(k)} \rightarrow \vec{P}_i^{(\infty)}$$

for each  $i$ . After possibly reversing the orientations of the planes  $P_i^{(k)}$ , we may assume that for each  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  if  $P_i^{(\infty)} = P_j^{(\infty)}$  then  $\vec{P}_i^{(\infty)} = \vec{P}_j^{(\infty)}$ . Thus

$$\mathbf{C}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_\infty = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i^{(\infty)} \llbracket P_i^{(\infty)} \rrbracket \text{ weakly in } \mathbf{B}_1(0).$$

It follows from (3.4) and the monotonicity formula (as in Lemma 2.8), for all  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$  and sufficiently large  $k$

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{B}_\sigma(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) \leq 2\varepsilon_k^{\frac{2}{n+2}}.$$

Letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  using (3.84) and (3.85) gives us

$$(3.86) \quad \text{spt } T_\infty \subseteq \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_\infty = \bigcup_{i=1}^p P_i^{(\infty)}.$$

Notice that any two distinct planes of  $\mathbf{C}_\infty$  must intersect either precisely along  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  or along an  $(n - 1)$ -dimensional linear subspace. Since  $T_\infty$  is area-minimizing, there is no  $X \in \text{sing } T_\infty \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})$  and  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\text{spt } T_\infty \cap \mathbf{B}_\delta(X)$  is a union of three or more distinct  $n$ -dimensional half-planes meeting along an  $(n - 1)$ -dimensional affine subspace passing through  $X$ . It follows that for each  $X \in \text{spt } T_\infty \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  and exactly one plane  $P_i^{(\infty)}$  of  $\mathbf{C}_\infty$  such that  $\text{spt } T_\infty \cap \mathbf{B}_\delta(X) = P_i^{(\infty)} \cap \mathbf{B}_\delta(X)$ . Hence  $\text{spt } T_\infty$  is the union of a subcollection

of distinct planes of  $\mathbf{C}_\infty$  such that any two planes intersect precisely along  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  and  $T_\infty$  has constant integer multiplicity on each plane. Consequently,  $\Theta(T_\infty, 0)$  is an integer. By the upper semi-continuity of density and  $\Theta(T_k, 0) \geq q$ , it follows that  $\Theta(T_\infty, 0) \geq q$ . But by (3.83) and  $\|T_k\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq (q+1/2)\omega_n$ , we must have that  $\Theta(T_\infty, 0) = \omega_n^{-1}\|T_\infty\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq q+1/2$ . Therefore,  $\Theta(T_\infty, 0) = q$ . By (3.83) and the fact that  $\text{spt } T_\infty$  is the union of a subcollection of distinct planes of  $\mathbf{C}_\infty$ ,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|T_k\|(\mathbf{A}_{\rho_k, 1/2}(\zeta_k)) \geq \|T_\infty\|(\mathbf{A}_{\rho_\infty, 1/2}(\zeta_\infty)) = q \mathcal{L}^n(\mathbf{A}_{\rho_\infty, 1/2}(0)),$$

contradicting (3.82).

Finally, let's verify (3.80) and (3.81). Let  $\rho \geq \tau/4$  and  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  with  $\rho^2 + |\zeta|^2 \leq (3+\gamma)^2/16$ . By (3.3) and (3.5) we can apply Remark 3.7 to obtain

$$(3.87) \quad Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq C\beta_0 \max\text{sep } \mathbf{C}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Since  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta) \subset \mathbf{B}_1(0)$ ,

$$(3.88) \quad E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)) \leq C\tau^{-(n+2)/2}\beta_0 \max\text{sep } \mathbf{C}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, p, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Let  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, p, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\tilde{\beta} = \tilde{\beta}(n, m, q, p, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  be small enough that we can apply Remark 3.8(2)(3)(4). If

$$\inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_{q, p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)) \geq \delta$$

then since  $\min\text{sep } \mathbf{C} \leq 2$  it follows from (3.88) that (3.80) holds true. Otherwise, by Remark 3.8 there exists an integer  $1 \leq \tilde{p} < p$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathcal{C}_{q, \tilde{p}}$  such that

$$(3.89) \quad \begin{aligned} Q(T, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)) &\leq 2^{p-1}\tilde{\beta}^{2-p}\delta, \\ Q(T, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)) &\leq 2^{p-1}\tilde{\beta}^{2-p} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_{q, p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)) \end{aligned}$$

and either  $\tilde{p} = 1$  or  $\tilde{p} > 1$  and

$$Q(T, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)) \leq \tilde{\beta} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{\tilde{p}-1} \mathcal{C}_{q, p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)).$$

It follows that (3.56) holds true with  $\eta_{(0, \zeta), \rho\#} T$  in place of  $T$ , that is

$$(3.90) \quad \max\text{sep } \mathbf{C} \leq C Q(T, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta))$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Combining (3.88), (3.90), and (3.89) gives us (3.80). When  $\rho = 1/4$  and  $\zeta = 0$ , we also have that  $\mathbf{A}_{1/4, 1/2}(0) \subset \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \cap \{r > 1/16\}$  and thus (3.87) gives us

$$(3.91) \quad Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{1/4, 1}(\zeta)) \leq C\beta_0 \max\text{sep } \mathbf{C}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, p, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Combining (3.91), (3.90), and (3.89) gives us (3.81).

In light of (3.76), (3.77), (3.79), and (3.81), we can apply Lemma 3.6 with  $\eta_{0, 1/4\#} T$  in place of  $T$ . In particular, by Lemma 3.6(a) with  $\eta_{0, 1/4\#} T$  in place of  $T$ , we deduce that Theorem 3.4(a) holds true. Thus by (3.76), (3.77), (3.79), (3.80), and (3.7), we can apply Lemma 3.5 with  $\eta_{(0, \zeta), \rho\#} T$  in place of  $T$  for all  $\rho \geq \tau/4$  and  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  with  $\rho^2 + |\zeta|^2 \leq (3+\gamma)^2/16$ .

To see conclusions (b) and (c), observe that  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho, \kappa}(\zeta) = \{(r\omega, y) : \omega \in \mathbb{S}^{m+1}, (r, y) \in B_{(1-\gamma)\kappa\rho/8}(\rho, \zeta)\}$  for each  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\rho > 0$ , and  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Note that if  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho, \kappa}(\zeta) \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho', \kappa}(\zeta') \neq \emptyset$  then  $|(\rho, \zeta) - (\rho', \zeta')| < \frac{1}{8}(1-\gamma)\kappa(\rho + \rho')$  and thus  $\frac{8-(1-\gamma)\kappa}{8+(1-\gamma)\kappa}\rho < \rho' < \frac{8+(1-\gamma)\kappa}{8-(1-\gamma)\kappa}\rho$ . By the Vitali covering lemma there is

a finite collection of  $\rho_j \geq \tau/4$  and  $\zeta_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  with  $\rho_j^2 + |\zeta_j|^2 \leq (3 + \gamma)^2/16$  (for  $1 \leq j \leq N$ ) such that  $\rho_{j+1} \leq \rho_j$  for all  $1 \leq j < N$ ,  $\{\mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 1/8}(\rho_j, \zeta_j)\}$  covers  $\mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \{r > \tau/4\}$ , and  $\{\mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 1/40}(\rho_j, \zeta_j)\}$  is pairwise disjoint. For each  $\sigma > 0$ , if  $\rho_j \leq \sigma/2$  then  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 1}(\zeta_j) \subset \{r \leq \sigma\}$ . Set  $J_\sigma = \max\{j : \rho_j \geq \sigma/2\}$ . Since  $\{B_{(1-\gamma)\rho_j/320}^{n-1}(\rho_j, \zeta_j)\}$  is a collection of pairwise disjoint balls in  $B_1^{n-1}(0)$ , for each  $\sigma > 0$

$$J_\sigma \omega_{n-1} \left( \frac{(1-\gamma)\sigma}{320} \right)^{n-1} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{J_\sigma} \mathcal{L}^{n-1}(B_{(1-\gamma)\rho_j/320}^{n-1}(\rho_j, \zeta_j)) \leq \mathcal{L}^{n-1}(B_1^{n-1}(0)) = \omega_{n-1}$$

and thus

$$(3.92) \quad J_\sigma \leq C\sigma^{1-n}$$

where  $C = ((1-\gamma)/320)^{1-n}$ . Let  $\{\psi_j\}$  be a smooth partition of unity of  $B_\gamma(0, P_i) \cap \{r > \tau\}$  subordinate to  $\{\mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 1/4}(\zeta_j)\}$  such that

$$(3.93) \quad 0 \leq \psi_i \leq 1, \quad \text{spt } \psi_i \subseteq \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 1/4}(\zeta_j), \quad |\nabla \psi_j| \leq \frac{C(n, \gamma)}{\rho_j}, \quad \sum_{j=1}^N \psi_i = 1.$$

Recalling (3.77), for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  and  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  we can apply Lemma 3.5(a) with  $\eta_{(0, \zeta_j), \rho_j \#} T$  in place of  $T$  to find integers  $q_{j,i}$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^p |q_{j,i}| \leq q$  and  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable currents  $T_{j,i}$  of  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 7/8}(\zeta_j)$  such that

$$(3.94) \quad T \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 7/8}(\zeta_j) = \sum_{i=1}^p T_{j,i},$$

$$(3.95) \quad (\partial T_{j,i}) \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 7/8}(\zeta_j) = 0,$$

$$(3.96) \quad (\pi_{P_i \#} T_{j,i}) \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 3/4}(\zeta_j) = q_{j,i} \llbracket P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 3/4}(\zeta_j) \rrbracket,$$

$$(3.97) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_{j,i}} \text{dist}(X, P_i) \leq C\rho_j^{-n/2} E,$$

where  $E = E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, p, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. By (3.78), (3.94), (3.96), (3.97), and Lemma 2.11

$$\begin{aligned} (q-1/2) \mathcal{L}^n(A_{\rho_j, 1/2}(0)) &< \|T\|(\mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 1/2}(\zeta_j)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^p \|T_{j,i}\|(\mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 1/2}(\zeta_j)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^p |q_{j,i}| \mathcal{L}^n(A_{\rho_j, 1/2}(0)) + C\rho_j^n E^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, p, \gamma, \tau) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Thus recalling  $E < \tau^{-(n+2)/2} \varepsilon_0$  and assuming  $\varepsilon_0$  is sufficiently small, we obtain  $q-1/2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^p |q_{j,i}| + 1/4$ . In other words, since  $q_{j,i}$  are integers and  $\sum_{i=1}^p |q_{j,i}| \leq q$ , we must have  $\sum_{i=1}^p |q_{j,i}| = q$ . Notice that if  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 7/8}(\zeta_j) \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_k, 7/8}(\zeta_k) \neq \emptyset$  then by (3.94) and (3.97)

$$T_{j,i} = T \llcorner \{X : \text{dist}(X, P_i) \leq C(\tau/4)^{-n/2} E\} = T_{k,i} \text{ in } \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 7/8}(\zeta_j) \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_k, 7/8}(\zeta_k)$$

for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , where  $C$  is as in (3.97) and using (3.5) and (3.6) we assume that  $\beta_0$  is small enough that  $6C(\tau/4)^{-(n+2)/2} E < \text{minsep } \mathbf{C}$ . Similarly, if  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 3/4}(\zeta_j) \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_k, 3/4}(\zeta_k) \neq \emptyset$  then by (3.96) we have  $q_{j,i} = q_{k,i}$  for all  $i$ . It follows that for each  $i$  there is a well-defined rectifiable current  $T_i$  such that  $T_i = T_{j,i}$  in  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho_j, 7/8}(\zeta_j)$  for all  $j$ . Since  $\mathbf{B}_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \tau/4\}$  is connected, we can take  $q_{j,i} = q_i$  for all  $j$  and  $i$ . (In particular,  $T_i$  and  $q_i$  are defined independent of  $j$ .) For each  $i$ , after possibly reversing the orientation of  $P_i$ , we may assume that  $q_i \geq 0$ . By Lemma 3.6(b)

with  $\eta_{0,1/4\#}T$  in place of  $T$ , we obtain  $q_i > 0$  (in  $(\pi_{P_i\#}T)_\# \mathbf{A}_{1/4,3/4}(0) = q_i \llbracket P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{1/4,3/4}(0) \rrbracket$ ). One readily verifies from this construction and (3.94)–(3.97) that  $T_i$  satisfies Theorem 3.4(b).

For each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  and  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  we can apply Lemma 3.5(b) with  $\eta_{(0,\zeta_j),\rho_j\#}T$  to find Lipschitz  $q_i$ -valued functions  $u_{j,i} : P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j,1/2}(\zeta_j) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(P_i^\perp)$  and closed sets  $K_{j,i} \subseteq P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j,1/2}(\zeta_j)$  such that

$$(3.98) \quad T_i \llcorner \pi_{P_i}^{-1}(K_{j,i}) = (\text{graph } u_{j,i}) \llcorner \pi_{P_i}^{-1}(K_{j,i}),$$

$$(3.99) \quad \mathcal{H}^n(P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j,1/2}(\zeta_j) \setminus K_{j,i}) + \|T_i\|(\pi_{P_i}^{-1}(P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j,1/2}(\zeta_j) \setminus K_{j,i})) \leq C \rho_j^{-2-(n+2)\alpha/2} E^{2+\alpha},$$

$$(3.100) \quad \sup_{P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j,1/2}(\zeta_j)} |u_{j,i}| \leq C \rho_j^{-n/2} E, \quad \sup_{P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j,1/2}(\zeta_j)} |\nabla u_{j,i}| \leq C \rho_j^{-(n+2)\alpha/2} E^\alpha,$$

where  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, p, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. By [Alm83, Definition 1.1(6) and Theorem 1.3], there exists an integer  $L(q, m) \geq 1$  and bi-Lipschitz embedding  $\xi : \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^L$  and  $\rho : \mathbb{R}^L \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $\text{Lip } \xi \leq 1$ ,  $\text{Lip } \xi^{-1}|_{\mathcal{Q}} \leq C(m, q)$ , and  $\text{Lip } \rho \leq C(m, q)$ , where  $\mathcal{Q} = \xi(\mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$ . For each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  define

$$(3.101) \quad K_i = B_\gamma(0, P_i) \cap \{r > \tau\} \setminus \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^N (P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j,1/4}(\zeta_j) \setminus K_{j,i}) \right),$$

$$(3.102) \quad u_i(X) = (\xi^{-1} \circ \rho) \left( \sum_{j=1}^N \psi_j(X) \xi(u_{j,i}(X)) \right) \text{ for all } X \in B_\gamma(0, P_i) \cap \{r > \tau\},$$

where  $\{\psi_j\}$  is the smooth partition of unity of  $B_\gamma(0, P_i) \cap \{r > \tau\}$  subordinate to  $\{\mathbf{A}_{\rho_j,1/4}(\zeta_j)\}$  satisfying (3.93). Arguing as in [KrumWic-a, Theorem 2.9], it follows from (3.99) that if  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho_k,1/2}(\zeta_k) \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j,1/2}(\zeta_j) \neq \emptyset$  then  $\mathcal{H}^n(K_{j,i} \cap K_{k,i}) > 0$ . Let  $Z \in K_{j,i} \cap K_{k,i}$  and note that by (3.98) we have  $u_{j,i}(Z) = u_{k,i}(Z)$ . Thus by (3.100) and  $\rho_k \leq \frac{65-\gamma}{63+\gamma} \rho_j$

$$(3.103) \quad \sup_{P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j,1/4}(\zeta_j) \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_k,1/4}(\zeta_k)} \mathcal{G}(u_{j,i}, u_{k,i}) \\ \leq \sup_{P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_j,1/2}(\zeta_j)} \mathcal{G}(u_{j,i}, u_{j,i}(Z)) + \sup_{P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho_k,1/2}(\zeta_j)} \mathcal{G}(u_{k,i}, u_{k,i}(Z)) \leq C \rho_j^{1-(n+2)\alpha/2} E^\alpha$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, p, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. By (3.98), (3.101), and (3.102), (3.12) holds true. Recalling that  $\{\mathbf{A}_{\rho_j,1/4}(\zeta_j)\}$  covers  $\mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \{r > \sigma\}$ ,  $\rho_j \geq \sigma/2$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, J_\sigma\}$ , and  $J_\sigma \leq C(n, \gamma) \sigma^{1-n}$  (as in (3.92)), it follows from (3.99) and (3.101) that (3.13) holds true. It follows from (3.102), (3.93), (3.100), and (3.103) that (3.14) holds true.  $\square$

**3.3. Initial a priori estimates.** Here and in Section 3.4 and Section 3.5, we establish several key integral estimates for locally area-minimizing rectifiable currents  $T$  close to a sum-of-planes  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ . These estimates are inspired by the results of [Sim93] for stationary varifolds in a “multiplicity 1 class”. We note that the multiplicity 1 class hypothesis in [Sim93] in particular rules out branch points a priori. In contrast to this, in the present setting higher multiplicity and branch points are permitted, and so the proofs of the estimates in the present setting require additional arguments and strategies, some of which are adaptations of arguments in [Wic14], [KrumWic17].



**Theorem 3.9.** *For each  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$  and Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , then:*

$$(a) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_\gamma(0)} \frac{|X^\perp|^2}{|X|^{n+2}} d\|T\|(X) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X),$$

$$(b) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_\gamma(0)} \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} |e_{m+2+j}^\perp|^2 d\|T\|(X) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X),$$

where  $(\cdot)^\perp$  denotes orthogonal projection onto the orthogonal complement of the approximate tangent plane to  $T$  at  $X$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality assume that  $\gamma \geq 1/2$ . Express each point  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  as  $X = (x, y)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{m+2}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Let  $r = r(X) = |x|$  and  $R = R(X) = |X|$  for each  $X = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . Let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a decreasing smooth function such that  $\psi(t) = 1$  for all  $t \leq \gamma$ ,  $\psi(t) = 0$  for all  $t \geq (1 + \gamma)/2$ ,  $|\psi'(t)| \leq 6/(1 - \gamma)$ , and  $|\psi''(t)| \leq 36/(1 - \gamma)^2$ . We have by the inequalities (2) and (3) of Lemma 3.4 of [Sim93] that

$$(3.104) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_\gamma(0)} R^{-n-2} |X^\perp|^2 d\|T\|(X) \leq C \left( \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \psi^2(R) d\|T\|(X) - \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \psi^2(R) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \right),$$

$$(3.105) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \left( 2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} |e_{m+2+j}|^2 \right) \psi^2(R) d\|T\|(X) \\ \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} |(x, 0)^\perp|^2 (\psi^2(R) + (\psi'(R))^2) d\|T\|(X) - 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) d\|T\|(X)$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . By the identity (6) of Lemma 3.4 of [Sim93],

$$(3.106) \quad 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \psi^2(R) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) = -2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \frac{r}{R^2} \psi(R) \psi'(R) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X).$$

Combining (3.104), (3.105), and (3.106)

$$(3.107) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_\gamma(0)} R^{-n-2} |X^\perp|^2 d\|T\|(X) + \int_{\mathbf{B}_\gamma(0)} \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} |e_{m+2+j}|^2 d\|T\|(X) \\ \leq C \left( \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} |(x, 0)^\perp|^2 (\psi^2(R) + (\psi'(R))^2) d\|T\|(X) \right. \\ \left. - 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) d\|T\|(X) + 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \right)$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Hence to prove the theorem it suffices to bound the right-hand side of (3.107) above by  $C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X)$  for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

Let  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, \gamma) > 0$  to be later determined. Let  $U$  be the union of all annuli  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/20}(\zeta)$  such that  $\rho^2 + |\zeta|^2 < (3 + \gamma)^2/16$  and

$$(3.108) \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)) \leq (q + 1/2) \mathcal{L}^n(A_{\rho, 1}(0)), \quad E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 2}(\zeta)) < \delta.$$

As we will see below,  $U$  is region where we can apply Lemma 3.5, Lemma 3.6, and Remark 3.8 to obtain a Lipschitz approximation of  $T$  relative to  $\mathbf{C}$  or some other cone in  $\mathcal{C}_{q, p}$ . Clearly  $U$  is open.

By (3.4) and (3.79) from the proof of Theorem 3.4 (with  $\tau = (1 - \gamma)/80$ ), we may assume  $\varepsilon_0$  is small enough that (3.108) holds true whenever  $\rho > (1 - \gamma)/80$  and  $\rho^2 + |\zeta|^2 < (3 + \gamma)^2/16$  and thus

$$(3.109) \quad \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \{r > (1 - \gamma)/80\} \subset U.$$

Define the locally Lipschitz cutoff function  $\chi : \mathbf{B}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\chi(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \text{dist}((x, y), \partial U) \geq |x|/2 \\ \frac{4}{|x|} \text{dist}((x, y), \partial U) - 1 & \text{if } |x|/4 < \text{dist}((x, y), \partial U) < |x|/2 \\ 0 & \text{if } \text{dist}((x, y), \partial U) \leq |x|/4. \end{cases}$$

Observe that  $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$  and  $|\nabla \chi(x, y)| \leq 6/|x|$ . Recall that  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho, \kappa}(\zeta) = \{(r\omega, y) : (r, y) \in B_{\kappa(1-\gamma)\rho/8}^{n-1}(\rho, \zeta), \omega \in \mathbb{S}^{m+1}\}$  for each  $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ ,  $\rho > 0$ , and  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Note that  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho, \kappa}(\zeta) \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho', \kappa}(\zeta') \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow |(\rho, \zeta) - (\rho', \zeta')| < \frac{1}{8} \kappa(1 - \gamma)(\rho + \rho')$ , in which case  $\frac{8-\kappa(1-\gamma)}{8+\kappa(1-\gamma)} \rho < \rho' < \frac{8+\kappa(1-\gamma)}{8-\kappa(1-\gamma)} \rho$ . By applying the Vitali covering lemma, there exists a countable collection  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $(\rho, \zeta)$  with  $\rho > 0$ ,  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , and  $\rho^2 + |\zeta|^2 < (3 + \gamma)^2/16$  such that (3.108) holds true for each  $(\rho, \zeta) \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $\{\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/20}(\zeta)\}_{(\rho, \zeta) \in \mathcal{I}}$  a collection of pairwise disjoint annuli, and

$$U \subset \bigcup_{(\rho, \zeta) \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/4}(\zeta).$$

Observe that if  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta) \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho', 1}(\zeta') \neq \emptyset$  then  $|(\rho, \zeta) - (\rho', \zeta')| < \frac{1}{8}(1 - \gamma)(\rho + \rho')$  and thus  $\frac{7+\gamma}{9-\gamma} \rho < \rho' < \frac{9-\gamma}{7+\gamma} \rho$ . Hence

$$B_{\frac{(1-\gamma)(7+\gamma)\rho}{160(9-\gamma)}}^{n-1}(\rho', \zeta') \subset B_{\frac{(1-\gamma)\rho'}{160}}^{n-1}(\rho', \zeta') \subset B_{\frac{(1-\gamma)\rho}{160} \left(20 + \frac{21(9-\gamma)}{7+\gamma}\right)}^{n-1}(\rho, \zeta)$$

which since  $\{B_{\frac{(1-\gamma)\rho'}{160}}^{n-1}(\rho', \zeta')\}_{(\rho', \zeta') \in \mathcal{I}}$  is a pairwise disjoint collection of balls implies that

$$\#\{(\rho', \zeta') \in \mathcal{I} : \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta) \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho', 1}(\zeta') \neq \emptyset\} \leq C(n, \gamma).$$

Thus there is an integer  $N \leq C(n, \gamma)$  and pairwise disjoint sets  $\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2, \dots, \mathcal{I}_N \subset \mathcal{I}$  such that  $\mathcal{I} = \bigcup_{j=1}^N \mathcal{I}_j$  and  $\{\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)\}_{(\rho, \zeta) \in \mathcal{I}_j}$  is a collection of pairwise disjoint annuli for each  $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Let  $\{\phi_{(\rho, \zeta)}\}_{(\rho, \zeta) \in \mathcal{I}}$  is a smooth partition of unity subordinate to  $\{\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta)\}_{(\rho, \zeta) \in \mathcal{I}}$  such that

$$(3.110) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi_{(\rho, \zeta)}(x, y) &= \phi_{(\rho, \zeta)}(\tilde{x}, y) \text{ whenever } |x| = |\tilde{x}|, \\ \text{spt } \phi_{(\rho, \zeta)} &\subset \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta), \quad |\nabla \tilde{\phi}_{(\rho, \zeta)}| = |\nabla \phi_{(\rho, \zeta)}| \leq \frac{C(n, \gamma)}{\rho}, \\ \sum_{(\rho, \zeta) \in \mathcal{I}} \phi_{(\rho, \zeta)} &= 1 \text{ on } \mathbf{B}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that for each  $(\rho, \zeta) \in \mathcal{I}$

$$(3.111) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta)} |(x, 0)^\perp|^2 (\psi^2(R) + (\psi'(R))^2) \phi_{(\rho, \zeta)} \chi d\|T\|(X) \\ &\quad - 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) \phi_{(\rho, \zeta)} \chi d\|T\|(X) + 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) \phi_{(\rho, \zeta)} \chi d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \\ &\leq C_0 \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C_0 = C_0(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Then by summing (3.111) over  $(\rho, \zeta) \in \mathcal{I} = \bigcup_{j=1}^N \mathcal{I}_j$  and keeping in mind that  $\text{spt } \psi \subset \mathbf{B}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)$ , we deduce that

$$(3.112) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} |(x, 0)^\perp|^2 (\psi^2(R) + (\psi'(R))^2) \chi d\|T\|(X) \\ & - 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) \chi d\|T\|(X) + 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) \chi d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \\ & \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

To see (3.111), fix  $(\rho, \zeta) \in \mathcal{I}$  and assume that  $\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta) \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $\tilde{\beta} = \tilde{\beta}(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$  to be later determined. Suppose that

$$(3.113) \quad E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)) \leq \tilde{\beta} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^q \mathcal{C}_{q, p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta))$$

Let  $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket$  for some integers  $q_i \geq 1$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^p q_i = q$  and  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes  $P_i$  with  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset P_i$ . Note that by Theorem 3.4(a), (3.7) holds true. Thus provided  $\delta$  and  $\tilde{\beta}$  are sufficiently small, by  $(\partial T) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0$ , (3.108), (3.113), and (3.7) we can apply Lemma 3.5 to show the following. By Lemma 3.5(a) there are integers  $\hat{q}_i$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^p |\hat{q}_i| \leq q$  and  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable currents  $T_i$  of  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 7/8}(\zeta)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} T \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 7/8}(\zeta) &= \sum_{i=1}^p T_i, \quad (\partial T_i) \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 7/8}(\zeta) = 0, \\ (\pi_{P_i \#} T_i) \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 3/4}(\zeta) &= \hat{q}_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 3/4}(\zeta), \\ \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_i} \text{dist}(X, P_i) &\leq C \rho E, \end{aligned}$$

where  $E = E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta))$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. By Lemma 3.5(b), for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  with  $\hat{q}_i \neq 0$  there exists Lipschitz  $|\hat{q}_i|$ -valued functions  $u_i : P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta) \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_{|\hat{q}_i|}(P_i^\perp)$  and closed sets  $K_i \subseteq P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta)$  such that

$$(3.114) \quad \begin{aligned} T_i \llcorner \pi_{P_i}^{-1}(K_i) &= (\text{graph } u_i) \llcorner \pi_{P_i}^{-1}(K_i), \\ \mathcal{H}^n(P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta) \setminus K_i) + \|T_i\|(\pi_{P_i}^{-1}(P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta) \setminus K_i)) &\leq C \rho^n E^{2+\alpha}, \\ \sup_{P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta)} |u_i| &\leq C \rho E, \quad \text{Lip } u_i \leq C E^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. For each  $X \in P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta)$ , let  $u_i(X) = \sum_{j=1}^{|\hat{q}_i|} \llbracket u_{i,j}(X) \rrbracket$  where  $u_{i,j}(X) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ .

Take any  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  with  $\hat{q}_i \neq 0$ . By Rademacher's Theorem [DelSpa11, Theorem 1.13],  $u_i$  is differentiable at  $\mathcal{H}^n$ -a.e.  $(x', y) \in K_i$  in the sense of [DelSpa11, Definition 1.9]. Let  $u_i$  be differentiable at  $(x', y) \in K_i$  and let  $X = (x, y) = (x', y) + u_{i,j}(x', y)$  be a point on  $\text{spt } T_i \cap \pi_{P_i}^{-1}(K_i)$ . Notice that

$$(x, 0)^\perp = u_{i,j}(x', y) - (\pi_X - \pi_{P_i})(x, 0)$$

where  $\pi_X$  is the orthogonal projection map onto the approximate tangent plane to  $T$  at  $X$  and satisfies  $\|\pi_X - \pi_{P_i}\| \leq C(n, m) |\nabla u_{i,j}(x', y)|$ . This together with (3.114) and Lemma 2.11 gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.115) \quad & \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta)} |(x, 0)^\perp|^2 (\psi^2(R) + (\psi'(R))^2) \phi_{(\rho, \zeta)}(x, y) d\|T_i\|(x, y) \\
& \leq C \int_{P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/4}(\zeta) \cap K_i} (|u_i|^2 + \rho^2 |\nabla u_i|^2) d\mathcal{H}^n(x', y) + CE^{2+\alpha} \\
& \leq C \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta)} (\text{dist}^2(X, P_i) + \rho^2 |\vec{T}_i - \vec{P}_i|^2) d\|T_i\|(X) + CE^{2+\alpha} \\
& \leq C \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 7/8}(\zeta)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_i) d\|T_i\|(X) + CE^{2+\alpha} \leq C \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Next define  $F : B_{(1+\gamma)/2}^n(0) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  by

$$\begin{aligned}
F(r, s, y) = & -\frac{r^2 + s^2}{\sqrt{r^2 + s^2 + |y|^2}} \psi\left(\sqrt{r^2 + s^2 + |y|^2}\right) \psi'\left(\sqrt{r^2 + s^2 + |y|^2}\right) \\
& \cdot \phi_{(\rho, \zeta)}\left(\sqrt{r^2 + s^2}, y\right) \chi\left(\sqrt{r^2 + s^2}, y\right)
\end{aligned}$$

for each  $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  with  $r^2 + s^2 + |y|^2 < (1 + \gamma)^2/4$ . Here by a slight abuse of notation we let  $\phi_{(\rho, \zeta)}(|x|, y)$  and  $\chi(|x|, y)$  denote the values of  $\phi_{(\rho, \zeta)}(x, y)$  and  $\chi(x, y)$  respectively. By the definition of  $\psi$ ,  $|\nabla \chi(x, y)| \leq 6/|x|$ , and (3.110),

$$(3.116) \quad F(r, s, y) \leq C\rho^2, \quad |F(r, s, y) - F(r, 0, y)| \leq Cs^2$$

for each  $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  with  $r^2 + s^2 + |y|^2 < (1 + \gamma)^2/4$ , where  $C = C(n, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Hence by (3.114), (3.116), and Lemma 2.11,

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.117) \quad & -2 \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) \phi_{(\rho, \zeta)} \chi d\|T_i\|(X) \\
& + 2|\widehat{q}_i| \int_{P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) \phi_{(\rho, \zeta)} \chi d\mathcal{H}^n(X) \\
& \leq 2 \int_{P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta)} \sum_{j=1}^{|\widehat{q}_i|} (F(r, |u_{i,j}(x, y)|, y) (1 + |\nabla u_{j,i}(x, y)|^2) - F(r, 0, y)) d\mathcal{H}^n(x, y) + CE^{2+\alpha} \\
& \leq C \int_{P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta)} (|u_i|^2 + \rho^2 |\nabla u_i|^2) d\mathcal{H}^n(x, y) + CE^{2+\alpha} \\
& \leq C \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1}(\zeta)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that by symmetry, the value of

$$\int_{P \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho, 1/2}(\zeta)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) \phi_{(\rho, \zeta)} \chi d\mathcal{H}^n(X)$$

is the same for all  $n$ -dimensional planes  $P$  with  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset P$  and thus using  $\sum_{i=1}^p |\widehat{q}_i| \leq q$

$$(3.118) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho,1/2}(\zeta)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) \phi_{(\rho,\zeta)} \chi d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^p |\widehat{q}_i| \int_{P_i \cap \mathbf{A}_{\rho,1/2}(\zeta)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) \phi_{(\rho,\zeta)} \chi d\mathcal{H}^n(X). \end{aligned}$$

Summing (3.115) and (3.117) over  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$  and using (3.118) gives us (3.111).

Suppose instead that

$$E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho,1}(\zeta)) > \widetilde{\beta} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{\rho,1}(\zeta)).$$

By Remark 3.8, there exists an integer  $1 \leq \widetilde{p} < p$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,\widetilde{p}}$  such that

$$(3.119) \quad \begin{aligned} & Q(T, \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho,1}(\zeta)) < 2^{q-1} \widetilde{\beta}^{1-q} \delta, \\ & Q(T, \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho,1}(\zeta)) \leq 2^{q-1} \widetilde{\beta}^{1-q} E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho,1}(\zeta)), \end{aligned}$$

and either  $\widetilde{p} = 1$  or  $\widetilde{p} > 1$  and

$$Q(T, \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{A}_{\rho,1}(\zeta)) \leq \widetilde{\beta} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{\widetilde{p}-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{\rho,1}(\zeta)).$$

Provided  $\delta$  and  $\widetilde{\beta}$  are sufficiently small, we can argue as in the previous paragraph with  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}$  and using Lemma 3.6 in place of Lemma 3.5 to show that

$$(3.120) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho,1/2}(\zeta)} |(x, 0)^\perp|^2 (\psi^2(R) + (\psi'(R))^2) \phi_{(\rho,\zeta)}(X) d\|T\|(X) \\ & - 2 \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho,1/2}(\zeta)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) \phi_{(\rho,\zeta)}(X) d\|T\|(X) \\ & + 2 \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho,1/2}(\zeta)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) \phi_{(\rho,\zeta)}(X) d\|\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}\|(X) \\ & \leq C \int_{\mathbf{A}_{\rho,1}(\zeta)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}) d\|T\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Thus bounding the right-hand side of (3.120) using (3.119) gives us (3.111) (with  $C_0 = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \widetilde{\beta}^{1-q}$ ). Now fix  $\delta$  and  $\widetilde{\beta}$  small enough that (3.111) holds true.

Observe that if  $(x, y) \in \mathbf{B}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \cap U$  and  $(\xi, \zeta) \in \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \partial U$  such that  $|(x, y) - (\xi, \zeta)| \leq |x|/2$ , then  $|x| \leq 2|\xi|$  and thus  $(x, y) \in B_{2|\xi|}(0, \zeta)$ . By (3.109), if  $(x, y) \in \mathbf{B}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \setminus U$ , then there exists  $t \geq 1$  such that  $(tx, y) \in \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \partial U$  and  $(x, y) \in B_{2t|x|}(0, y)$ . Hence

$$\{(x, y) \in \mathbf{B}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) : \text{dist}((x, y), \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \partial U) \leq |x|/2\} \subset \bigcup_{(\xi, \zeta) \in \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \partial U} \mathbf{B}_{2|\xi|}(0, \zeta).$$

By applying the Vitali covering lemma, there exists a countable collection  $\mathcal{J}$  of  $(\xi, \zeta) \in \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \partial U$  such that  $\{\mathbf{B}_{2|\xi|}(0, \zeta) : (\xi, \zeta) \in \mathcal{J}\}$  a collection of pairwise disjoint balls and

$$\{(x, y) \in \mathbf{B}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) : \text{dist}((x, y), \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \partial U) \leq |x|/2\} \subset \bigcup_{(\xi, \zeta) \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{B}_{10|\xi|}(0, \zeta).$$

Take any  $(\xi, \zeta) \in \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \partial U$ . We claim that

$$(3.121) \quad \|T\|(\mathbf{A}_{|\xi|,1}(\zeta)) < (q+1/2) \mathcal{L}^n(A_{|\xi|,1}(0)).$$

Note that by (3.109),  $|\xi| < (1-\gamma)/80$  and thus  $\mathbf{A}_{|\xi|,2}(\zeta) \subset \mathbf{B}_{2|\xi|}(0, \zeta) \subset \mathbf{B}_1(0)$ . Since  $(\xi, \zeta)$  does not satisfy (3.108) with  $\rho = |\xi|$ , it follows that

$$(3.122) \quad E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_{2|\xi|}(0, \zeta)) \geq \delta.$$

To see (3.121), since  $(\xi, \zeta) \in \mathbf{B}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \partial U$  there exists  $\rho' > 0$  and  $\zeta' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  such that  $(\rho')^2 + |\xi'|^2 < (3+\gamma)^2/16$ ,  $\text{dist}((\xi, \zeta), \mathbf{A}_{\rho',1/20}(\zeta')) < \frac{1-\gamma}{40} |\xi|$ , and (3.108) holds true with  $(\rho', \zeta')$  in place of  $(\rho, \zeta)$ . Hence  $|(\rho', \zeta') - (|\xi|, \zeta)| < \frac{1-\gamma}{160} \rho' + \frac{1-\gamma}{40} |\xi|$  and consequently  $\frac{1}{2} \rho' < \frac{159+\gamma}{164-4\gamma} \rho' \leq |\xi| \leq \frac{161-\gamma}{156+4\gamma} \rho' < \frac{5}{4} \rho'$ . Thus

$$B_{(1-\gamma)|\xi|/8}^{n-1}(|\xi|, \zeta) \subset B_{(1-\gamma)\rho'/160+6(1-\gamma)|\xi|/40}^{n-1}(\rho', \zeta') \subset B_{31(1-\gamma)\rho'/160}^{n-1}(\rho', \zeta'),$$

or equivalently  $\mathbf{A}_{|\xi|,1}(\zeta) \subset \mathbf{A}_{\rho',31/20}(\zeta')$ . Moreover, by the monotonicity formula and  $\frac{1}{2} \rho' < |\xi| < (1-\gamma)/80$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|T\|(\mathbf{A}_{\rho',2}(\zeta')) &\leq \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_{2\rho'}(0, \zeta')) \leq \left(\frac{40\rho'}{1-\gamma}\right)^n \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_{(1-\gamma)/20}(0, \zeta')) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{40\rho'}{1-\gamma}\right)^n \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq (q+1/2) \omega_n \left(\frac{40\rho'}{1-\gamma}\right)^n. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose by way of contradiction that for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  we had  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\rho_k, \rho'_k > 0$ ,  $\zeta_k, \zeta'_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current  $T_k$  of  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho'_k,2}(\zeta'_k)$ , and  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  such that  $\mathbf{A}_{\rho_k,1}(\zeta_k) \subset \mathbf{A}_{\rho'_k,31/20}(0, \zeta'_k)$  and

$$(3.123) \quad (\partial T_k) \llcorner \mathbf{A}_{\rho'_k,2}(\zeta'_k) = 0,$$

$$(3.124) \quad \|T_k\|(\mathbf{A}_{\rho'_k,2}(\zeta'_k)) \leq (q+1/2) \omega_n \left(\frac{40\rho'_k}{1-\gamma}\right)^n,$$

$$(3.125) \quad \|T_k\|(\mathbf{A}_{\rho'_k,1}(\zeta'_k)) \leq (q+1/2) \mathcal{L}^n(A_{\rho'_k,1}(0)),$$

$$(3.126) \quad E(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{A}_{\rho'_k,2}(0, \zeta'_k)) < \delta_k,$$

$$(3.127) \quad \|T_k\|(\mathbf{A}_{\rho_k,1}(\zeta_k)) \geq (q+1/2) \mathcal{L}^n(A_{\rho_k,1}(0)).$$

By rescaling, we may take  $\zeta'_k = 0$  and  $\rho'_k = 1$ . By (3.123), (3.124), the Federer-Fleming compactness theorem, and [Sim83, Theorem 34.5], after passing to a subsequence there exists an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current  $T_\infty$  of  $\mathbf{A}_{1,2}(0)$  such that  $T_k \rightarrow T_\infty$  weakly in  $\mathbf{A}_{1,2}(0)$  and  $\|T_k\| \rightarrow \|T_\infty\|$  in the sense of Radon measures of  $\mathbf{A}_{1,2}(0)$ . Arguing as we did to prove (3.79), it follows from (3.126) that  $\text{spt } T_\infty$  is a union of  $n$ -dimensional planes intersecting along  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . By (3.125),  $\|T_\infty\|(\mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)) \leq (q+1/2) \mathcal{L}^n(A_{1,1}(0))$  so that  $T_\infty$  is a sum of integer multiplicity planes to total multiplicity  $\leq q$ , contradicting (3.127). Therefore, (3.121) must hold true.

Recall that by (3.109),  $|\xi| < (1-\gamma)/80$ . Hence by the monotonicity formula,

$$(3.128) \quad \begin{aligned} \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_{10|\xi|}(0, \zeta)) &\leq \left(\frac{80|\xi|}{1-\gamma}\right)^n \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_{(1-\gamma)/8}(0, \zeta)) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{80|\xi|}{1-\gamma}\right)^n \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq (q+1/2) \omega_n \left(\frac{80|\xi|}{1-\gamma}\right)^n. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.122) and (3.128), for each  $(\xi, \zeta) \in \mathcal{J}$

$$(3.129) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{B}_{10|\xi|}(0, \zeta)} |(x, 0)^\perp|^2 (\psi^2(R) + (\psi'(R))^2) (1 - \chi) d\|T\|(X) \\ & - 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_{10|\xi|}(0, \zeta)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) (1 - \chi) d\|T\|(X) \\ & \leq C |\xi|^{n+2} \leq \frac{C}{\delta} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{2|\xi|}(0, \zeta)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Summing (3.129) over  $(\xi, \zeta) \in \mathcal{J}$  gives us

$$(3.130) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{B}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} |(x, 0)^\perp|^2 (\psi^2(R) + (\psi'(R))^2) (1 - \chi) d\|T\|(X) \\ & - 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0)} \frac{r^2}{R} \psi(R) \psi'(R) (1 - \chi) d\|T\|(X) \\ & \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Adding (3.112) and (3.130) gives us the desired upper bound on the right-hand side of (3.107).  $\square$

**Corollary 3.10.** *For each  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(n, m, q, \gamma, \sigma) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n, m, q, \gamma, \sigma) \in (0, 1)$  if  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$  and Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , then*

$$(3.131) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_\gamma(0)} \frac{\text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C})}{R^{n+2-\sigma}} d\|T\|(X) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X),$$

where  $R = R(X) = |X|$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant.

*Proof.* This follows from Theorem 3.9(a) exactly as in the proof of Lemma 3.4 of [Sim93].  $\square$

**3.4. A priori estimates for area-minimizers close to a plane.** In this section we will focus on the case where  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  are close to an  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P_0$ .

**Preliminary remarks.** After an orthogonal change of coordinates, assume that  $P_0 = \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ . We identify  $P_0 \cong \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $P_0^\perp \cong \mathbb{R}^m$ . Set  $\mathbf{P}_0 = q\llbracket P_0 \rrbracket$  where  $P_0$  is oriented by  $\vec{P}_0 = e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_n$ , where  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{n+m}$  is the standard basis for  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . We will represent points  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  as  $X = (z, x, y)$  where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . For each  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , and  $\rho > 0$  we let

$$\begin{aligned} B_\rho(x_0, y_0) &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} : |x - x_0|^2 + |y - y_0|^2 < \rho^2\}, \\ \mathbf{C}_\rho(x_0, y_0) &= \mathbb{R}^m \times B_\rho(x_0, y_0). \end{aligned}$$

We shall make the following hypothesis for appropriate choices of constants  $\eta_0 \in (0, 1)$  and  $M \in [1, \infty)$ , to be chosen ultimately depending only on  $n, m$  and  $q$ :

**Hypothesis  $(\dagger)$ .**  $2 \leq p \leq q$  are integers,  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ , and  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with  $\partial T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0$  such that

$$(3.132) \quad E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \eta_0,$$

$$(3.133) \quad E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq M \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(T, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)).$$

Suppose that  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$  (of Section 3.1) and Hypothesis  $(\dagger)$ . By (3.132) and Lemma 2.19,

$$(3.134) \quad \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{7/8}(0)} \text{dist}(X, P_0) \leq CE(T, P_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m) \in (0, \infty)$ . By the constancy theorem,  $(\pi_{P_0\#}(T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{7/8}(0))) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0)$  is an integer multiple of  $\llbracket P_0 \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0)$ . We claim that in fact  $(\pi_{P_0\#}(T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{7/8}(0))) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0) = \pm q \llbracket P_0 \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0)$ . Thus up to reversing the orientation of  $T$ , we may assume that

$$(3.135) \quad (\pi_{P_0\#}(T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{7/8}(0))) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0) = q \llbracket P_0 \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0).$$

To see this, for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  let  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\eta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ , and  $T_k$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current of  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  satisfying (3.3) and (3.132) with  $\varepsilon_k, \eta_k, T_k$  in place of  $\varepsilon, \eta, T$ . By (3.3) and the Federer-Fleming compactness theorem, after passing to a subsequence there exists an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current  $T_\infty$  such that  $T_k \rightarrow T_\infty$  weakly in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$ . By (3.3), (3.134), and the constancy theorem,  $T_\infty \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0) = \pm q \llbracket P_0 \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0)$ . Up to reversing the orientation of each  $T_k$ , we may assume that  $T_\infty \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0) = q \llbracket P_0 \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0)$ . By again applying the constancy theorem,  $(\pi_{P_0\#}(T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{7/8}(0))) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0)$  is an integer multiple of  $\llbracket P_0 \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0)$ . By continuity of push-forwards under weak limits,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\pi_{P_0\#}(T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{7/8}(0))) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{P_0\#}(T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{7/8}(0) \cap \mathbf{C}_{3/4}(0)) \\ &= \pi_{P_0\#}(T_\infty \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{3/4}(0)) = q \llbracket P_0 \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0) \end{aligned}$$

where the limits are taken in the weak topology in  $\mathbf{C}_{3/4}(0)$ . Therefore,  $(\pi_{P_0\#}(T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{7/8}(0))) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0) = q \llbracket P_0 \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0)$  for infinitely many  $k$ , which in view of the arbitrary choice of sequence  $(T_k)$  proves (3.135).

By (3.135), for each  $X \in P_0 \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  there exists  $Y \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{7/8}(0)$  such that  $\pi_{P_0}(Y) = X$  and thus by (3.134)

$$\text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T) \leq |X - Y| = \text{dist}(Y, P_0) \leq CE(T, P_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)).$$

Hence

$$(3.136) \quad \begin{aligned} Q(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1)^2 &= E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1)^2 + q \int_{P_0 \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \cap \{|x| > 1/16\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\mathcal{H}^n(X) \\ &\leq E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1)^2 + 2q\omega_n \sup_{X \in P_0 \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) < CE(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1)^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ .

By the triangle inequality,  $\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq (q + 1/2)\omega_n$ , (3.132), (3.134), (3.5), and (3.136),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_0) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \\ &\quad + 2q\omega_n \sup_{\text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_0) < CE(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1)^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Since  $P_0$  is a plane and  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ ,

$$(3.137) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_0 \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < CE(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1)$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Hence letting  $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket$  as in (3.1), for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  there is an  $m \times 2$  matrix  $A_i$  such that

$$(3.138) \quad P_i = \{(z, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : z = A_i x\},$$

$$(3.139) \quad \|A_i\| \leq CE(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1),$$



where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the Frobenius norm and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Up to reversing the orientation of  $P_i$ , we may assume that

$$(3.140) \quad |\vec{P}_i - \vec{P}_0| < 1/2$$

so that  $P_i$  is equipped with the induced orientation on the graph of  $(x, y) \mapsto A_i x$  over the oriented plane  $P_0$ . By Theorem 3.4(a),

$$(3.141) \quad \min_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{S}^1} |A_i x - A_j x| \geq c \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{A}_{1,1}(0)),$$

$$(3.142) \quad \|A_i - A_j\| \leq C \inf_{x \in \mathbb{S}^1} |A_i x - A_j x| \text{ for all } 1 \leq i < j \leq p,$$

where  $c = c(n, m, q) > 0$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ .

Let  $P$  be an  $n$ -dimensional oriented plane in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and let  $\mathbf{P} = q\llbracket P \rrbracket$ . By the triangle inequality,  $\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq (q + 1/2)\omega_n$ , (3.133), (3.5), and (3.136)

$$(3.143) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{M^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_0) d\|T\|(X) \leq \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|T\|(X) \\ & \leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) + 2(q + 1/2)\omega_n \sup_{X \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) \\ & \leq 2C\beta_0^2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_0) d\|T\|(X) + 2(q + 1/2)\omega_n \sup_{X \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Choosing  $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n, m, q, M)$  small enough that  $CM^2\beta_0^2 < 1/4$  (where  $C$  is as in (3.143)),

$$(3.144) \quad E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq CM \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0))$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . In particular, if  $P = \{(z, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : z = Ax\}$  for some  $m \times 2$  matrix  $A$ , then

$$(3.145) \quad E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq CM \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \|A_i - A\|.$$

Setting  $A = 0$  in (3.145) gives us

$$(3.146) \quad \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \|A_i\| \geq \frac{c}{M} E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$$

for some constant  $c = c(n, m, q) > 0$ . Setting  $A = A_j$  for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  in (3.145) gives us

$$(3.147) \quad \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \|A_i - A_j\| \geq \frac{c}{M} E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$$

for some constant  $c = c(n, m, q) > 0$ . By (3.142) and (3.147),

$$(3.148) \quad \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{S}^1} |A_i x - A_j x| \geq \frac{c}{M} E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$$

for some constant  $c = c(n, m, q) > 0$ .

In blow-up arguments, we typically let  $\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i^{(k)} \rrbracket$  where  $P_i^{(k)} = \{(z, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : z = A_i^{(k)} x\}$  for some  $m \times 2$  matrix  $A_i^{(k)}$  with  $\|A_i^{(k)}\| \leq C(n, m, q) \widehat{E}_k$ , where  $\widehat{E}_k = E(T_k, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. After passing to a subsequence, there is an  $m \times 2$  matrix

$\Lambda_i$  such that  $A_i^{(k)}/\widehat{E}_k \rightarrow \Lambda_i$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ . By dividing (3.139), (3.146), (3.147), and (3.148), all taken with  $T = T_k$  and  $A_i = A_i^{(k)}$ , by  $\widehat{E}_k$  and letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(3.149) \quad \|\Lambda_i\| \leq C, \quad \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \|\Lambda_i\| \geq \frac{c}{M}, \quad \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \|\Lambda_i - \Lambda_j\| \geq \frac{c}{M},$$

$$(3.150) \quad \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{S}^1} |\Lambda_i x - \Lambda_j x| \geq \frac{c}{M}$$

for some constants  $c = c(n, m, q) > 0$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . We will frequently use the fact that by (3.150) if  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$  such that  $\Lambda_i x = \Lambda_j x$  for all  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  then  $x = 0$ .

When  $T$  is close to the plane  $P_0$  as in (3.132), we can restate Theorem 3.4 as follows:

**Theorem 3.11.** *Given integers  $2 \leq p \leq q$  and  $0 < \tau < \gamma < 1$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \eta_0 \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m, q, p, \gamma, \tau$  such that if  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , (3.132), (3.135), and (3.140), then:*

(a) (3.6) and (3.7) hold true;

(b) up to changing the values of the multiplicities  $q_i$  of the planes of  $\mathbf{C}$ , there exists  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable currents  $T_i$  of  $\mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \{r > \tau/4\}$  such that

$$(3.151) \quad \begin{aligned} T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{(7+\gamma)/8}(0) \cap \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \{r > \tau/4\} &= \sum_{i=1}^p T_i, \\ (\partial T_i) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \{r > \tau/4\} &= 0, \\ (\pi_{P_0 \#} T_i) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \cap \{r > \tau/2\} &= q_i \llcorner [P_0] \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \cap \{r > \tau/2\}, \\ \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_i \cap \{r > \sigma\}} \text{dist}(X, P_i) &\leq C_\sigma E \text{ for all } \sigma \in [\tau/2, 1/2], \end{aligned}$$

where  $r(X) = \text{dist}(X, \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})$ ,  $E = E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ , and  $C_\sigma = C_\sigma(n, m, q, \gamma, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants;

(c) for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  there exists Lipschitz  $q_i$ -valued functions  $u_i : B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \tau\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and a closed set  $K \subseteq B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \tau\}$  such that

$$(3.152) \quad \begin{aligned} T_i \llcorner (\mathbb{R}^m \times K) &= \text{graph}(A_i x + u_i) \llcorner (\mathbb{R}^m \times K), \\ \mathcal{H}^n(B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \sigma\} \setminus K) + \|T_i\|(\mathbb{R}^m \times (B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \sigma\} \setminus K)) &\leq C_\sigma E^{2+\alpha}, \\ \sup_{B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \sigma\}} |u_i| &\leq C_\sigma E, \quad \sup_{B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \sigma\}} |\nabla u_i| \leq C_\sigma E^\alpha \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\sigma \in [\tau, 1/2]$ , where again  $E = E(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$  and  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $C_\sigma = C_\sigma(n, m, q, \gamma, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants.

*Proof.* Conclusion (a) is the same as Theorem 3.4(a) with  $(1 + \gamma)/2$  and  $\tau/2$  in place of  $\gamma$  and  $\tau$ . Conclusion (b) follows by using (3.132), (3.134), (3.137), and Theorem 3.4(b) with  $(1 + \gamma)/2$  and  $\tau/2$  in place of  $\gamma$  and  $\tau$ . Conclusion (c) follows from Almgren's Strong Lipschitz Approximation Theorem (Theorem 2.9) and (3.138).  $\square$

We also have the following consequence of Theorem 3.9 and Theorem 3.11.

**Corollary 3.12.** *For each  $0 < \tau < \gamma < 1$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \eta_0 \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m, q, \gamma, \tau$  such that if  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , (3.132), (3.135), and*

(3.140), then:

$$(3.153) \quad \sum_{i=1}^p \int_{B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \tau\}} R^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial(u_i/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X),$$

where  $R(x, y) = |(x, y)|$ ,  $u_i : B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \tau\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  are as in Theorem 3.11(c), and  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant.

*Proof.* Let  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ . Throughout this proof, let  $(x', y)$  denote points in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $x' \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . For each  $(x', y) \in B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \tau\}$  let  $u_i(x', y) = \sum_{j=1}^{q_i} \llbracket u_{i,j}(x', y) \rrbracket$  where  $u_{i,j}(x', y) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . By Rademacher's Theorem [DelSpa11, Theorem 1.13],  $u_i$  is differentiable at  $\mathcal{H}^n$ -a.e.  $(x', y) \in K$  in the sense of [DelSpa11, Definition 1.9]. Let  $u_i$  be differentiable at  $(x', y) \in K$  and let  $x = (A_i x' + u_{i,j}(x', y), x')$  for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_i\}$  so that  $X = (x, y) = (A_i x' + u_{i,j}(x', y), x', y)$  is a point on  $\text{spt } T_i \cap (\mathbb{R}^m \times K_i)$ . Then  $\frac{\partial}{\partial R}(u_{i,j}(x', y), x', y)$  is tangential to  $\text{spt } T_i$  at  $X$  and thus

$$(x, y)^\perp = R^2 \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial R} \left( \frac{(A_i x' + u_{i,j}(x', y), x', y)}{R} \right) \right)^\perp = R^2 \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial R} \left( \frac{(u_{i,j}(x', y), 0, 0)}{R} \right) \right)^\perp,$$

where  $R = |(x', y)|$  and  $(\cdot)^\perp$  denotes the orthogonal projection onto the approximate tangent plane to  $T$  at  $X$ . Since by Theorem 3.11(c)  $\text{Lip } u_i \leq CE^\alpha$  is small,

$$|(x, y)^\perp| \geq \frac{1}{2} R^2 \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial R} \left( \frac{u_{i,j}(x', y)}{R} \right) \right|$$

Now (3.153) follows from Theorem 3.9(a) and Theorem 3.11(c).  $\square$

Next we derive further a priori estimates based on [Sim93, Theorem 3.1] and [Wic14, Corollary 10.2].

**Theorem 3.13.** *For all integers  $2 \leq p \leq q$ ,  $0 < \tau < \gamma < 1$ ,  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ , and  $M \in [1, \infty)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \eta_0 \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m, q, p, \gamma, \tau, \sigma, M$  such that the following holds true. Suppose that  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\dagger)$ , (3.135), and (3.140). Let  $Z = (\chi, \xi, \zeta) \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  such that  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ . Then*

$$(a) \quad |\chi|^2 + \widehat{E}^2 |\xi|^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X),$$

$$(b) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(Z)} \text{dist}(X - Z, \text{spt } \mathbf{C})^2 d\|T\|(X) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X),$$

where  $\widehat{E} = E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, p, M) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant (independent of  $\tau$ ). Moreover,

$$(c) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_\gamma(0)} \frac{\text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X)}{|X - Z|^{n+2-\sigma}} \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X),$$

$$(d) \quad \int_{B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \tau\}} \frac{|u_i(x, y) - \chi + A_i \xi|^2}{|(x, y) - (\xi, \zeta)|^{n+2-\sigma}} \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) \text{ for all } i$$

where  $A_i$  are as in (3.138),  $u_i : B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \tau\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  are as in Theorem 3.11(c), and  $C = C(n, m, q, p, \gamma, M, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant (independent of  $\tau$ ).

The proof of Theorem 3.13 is similar to that of [Wic14, Corollary 10.2] with some minor changes. We provide some details for completion. We shall assume the inductive hypothesis that  $p_0 \in \{2, 3, \dots, q\}$  such that either  $p_0 = 2$  or  $p_0 > 2$  and

(H6) Theorem 3.13 holds true for all  $p \in \{2, 3, \dots, p_0 - 1\}$ .

Theorem 3.13 in the case  $p = p_0$  will follow from three preliminary results Lemma 3.14, Lemma 3.15, and Corollary 3.17.

**Lemma 3.14.** *For all integers  $q, p$  with  $2 \leq p \leq q$ , any  $M \in [1, \infty)$  and any  $\delta > 0$ , there exist  $\varepsilon, \beta, \eta \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m, q, M, \delta$  such that if  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , and Hypothesis  $(\dagger)$  with  $\varepsilon, \beta, \eta$  in place of  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \eta_0$  and if  $Z = (\chi, \xi, \zeta) \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  is such that  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ , then*

$$(3.154) \quad |\chi|^2 + \widehat{E}^2 |\xi|^2 \leq \delta^2 \widehat{E}^2,$$

where  $\widehat{E} = E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $\delta > 0$ . Suppose to the contrary that for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  there exists  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\beta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\gamma_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ , and  $T_k$  such that Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\dagger)$ , (3.135), and (3.140) hold true with  $\varepsilon_k, \beta_k, \eta_k, \mathbf{C}_k, T_k$  in place of  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \eta_0, \mathbf{C}, T$  but there is a point  $Z_k = (\chi_k, \xi_k, \zeta_k) \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  such that  $\Theta(T_k, Z_k) \geq q$

$$(3.155) \quad |\chi_k|^2 + \widehat{E}_k^2 |\xi_k|^2 \geq \delta^2 \widehat{E}_k^2,$$

where  $\widehat{E}_k = E(T_k, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ . Let  $\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i^{(k)} \rrbracket$  where  $q_i$  are integers with  $\sum_{i=1}^p q_i = q$  and  $P_i^{(k)} = \{(z, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : z = A_i^{(k)} x\}$  for some distinct  $m \times 2$  matrices  $A_i^{(k)}$  with  $\|A_i^{(k)}\| \leq C(n, m, q) \widehat{E}_k$ . After passing to a subsequence assume that  $q_i$  are independent of  $k$ . Arguing as in [KrumWic21, Section 2], we can blow-up  $T_k$  relative to  $\mathbf{P}_0$  by using Almgren's Strong Lipschitz Approximation Theorem (Theorem 2.9) to find a Lipschitz approximating function  $f_k : B_{3/4}(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m)$  of  $T_k$  in  $\mathbf{C}_{3/4}(0)$ , followed by standard arguments giving, after passing to a subsequence,  $f_k / \widehat{E}_k \rightarrow w$  in  $L^2(B_{3/4}(0), \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$ . After passing to a subsequence for each  $i$  let  $A_i^{(k)} / \widehat{E}_k \rightarrow \Lambda_i$  as  $m \times 2$  matrices. By Theorem 3.11(c) and (3.5),  $w$  is also a blow-up of  $\mathbf{C}_k$  relative to  $\mathbf{P}_0$  and in particular

$$(3.156) \quad w(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket \Lambda_i x \rrbracket.$$

Using the Hardt-Simon inequality ([KrumWic-a, Lemma 5.3]), after passing to a subsequence  $(\xi_k, \zeta_k) \rightarrow (\xi, \zeta)$  in  $\overline{B_{1/2}(0)}$  and  $\chi_k / \widehat{E}_k \rightarrow \lambda$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  such that

$$\int_{B_{1/4}(\xi, \zeta)} R^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial R} \left( \frac{w - \lambda}{R} \right) \right|^2 \leq C$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  and thus  $w(\xi, \zeta) = q \llbracket \lambda \rrbracket$ . But by (3.156) and (3.150), we have  $w(\xi, \zeta) = q \llbracket \lambda \rrbracket$  only if  $\xi = 0$  and  $\lambda = 0$ . Therefore,  $\xi_k \rightarrow \xi = 0$  and  $\chi_k / \widehat{E}_k \rightarrow \lambda = 0$ , contradicting (3.155).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.15.** *Let  $3 \leq p_0 \leq q$  be integers such that (H6) holds true. Given  $M \in [1, \infty)$  and  $\delta > 0$  there exist  $\varepsilon, \beta, \gamma, \eta \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m, q, p_0, M, \delta$  such that the following holds true. Let  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$  (of Section 3.1) and Hypothesis  $(\dagger)$  with  $\varepsilon, \beta, \eta$  in place of  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \eta_0$ . Let  $Z = (\chi, \xi, \zeta) \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  be such that  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ . Suppose that for some  $s \in \{2, 3, \dots, p_0 - 1\}$*

$$(3.157) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^s \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq \gamma \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{s-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0)).$$

Then

$$(3.158) \quad |\chi|^2 + \widehat{E}^2 |\xi|^2 \leq \delta^2 \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^s \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0))^2,$$

where  $\widehat{E} = E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ .

**Remark 3.16.** By (3.136) and (3.157),  $\inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^s \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq \gamma_0 E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ .

*Proof of Lemma 3.15.* The proof is similar to that of [Wic14, Proposition 10.7] with some minor changes and we sketch the proof for completion. Without loss of generality, fix  $M \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $\delta > 0$  and  $2 \leq s < p_0 \leq q$ . Suppose to the contrary that for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  there exists  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\beta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\gamma_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\eta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p_0}$ , and a locally area minimizing rectifiable current  $T_k$  of  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  such that Hypothesis ( $\star$ ), Hypothesis ( $\star\star$ ), Hypothesis ( $\dagger$ ), (3.157) hold true with  $\varepsilon_k, \beta_k, \gamma_k, \eta_k, \mathbf{C}_k, T_k$  in place of  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \gamma_0, \eta_0, \mathbf{C}, T$  but for some  $Z_k = (\chi_k, \xi_k, \zeta_k) \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  such that  $\Theta(T_k, Z_k) \geq q$

$$(3.159) \quad |\chi_k|^2 + \widehat{E}_k^2 |\xi_k|^2 \geq \delta^2 \widetilde{Q}_k^2,$$

where  $\widehat{E}_k = E(T_k, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$  and  $\widetilde{Q}_k = \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^s \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ . Let  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,s}$  such that  $Q(T_k, \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq 2\widetilde{Q}_k$ . Express  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  as  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_k = \sum_{i=1}^p \widetilde{q}_i \llbracket \widetilde{P}_i^{(k)} \rrbracket$  where  $\widetilde{q}_i$  are integers with  $\sum_{i=1}^p \widetilde{q}_i = q$  and  $\widetilde{P}_i^{(k)} = \{(z, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : z = A_i^{(k)} x\}$  for some  $m \times 2$  matrices  $A_i^{(k)}$  with  $\|A_i^{(k)}\| \leq C(n, m, q) \widehat{E}_k$ . After passing to a subsequence assume that  $q_i$  are independent of  $k$ . Let  $\tau_k \rightarrow 0^+$  and  $u_i^{(k)} : B_{3/4}(0) \cap \{r > \tau_k\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  be as in Theorem 3.11(c) with  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_k, T_k, u_i^{(k)}$  in place of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}, T, u_i$ . After passing to a subsequence, blow-up  $T_k$  relative to  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  by letting  $u_i^{(k)}/\widetilde{Q}_k \rightarrow w_i$  in  $L^2(B_{3/4}(0) \cap \{r > \sigma\}, \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m))$  for each  $\sigma > 0$ . By Theorem 3.11(c) and (3.5),  $w_i$  is also a blow-up of  $\mathbf{C}_k$  relative to  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  and in particular

$$(3.160) \quad w_i(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{q_i} \llbracket M_{i,j} x \rrbracket.$$

for some  $m \times 2$  matrices  $M_{i,j}$  (not necessarily distinct). By (H6) we can apply Theorem 3.13(a) with  $T_k$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  in place of  $T$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  to obtain  $|\chi_k|^2 + \widehat{E}_k^2 |\xi_k|^2 \leq C \widehat{E}_k^2$  for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, M) \in (0, \infty)$ . After passing to a subsequence let  $\chi_k/\widetilde{Q}_k \rightarrow \lambda$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\widehat{E}_k \xi_k/\widetilde{Q}_k \rightarrow \kappa$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $\zeta_k \rightarrow \zeta$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , and  $A_i^{(k)}/\widehat{E}_k \rightarrow \Lambda_i$  as  $m \times 2$  matrices. By (H6), we can apply Theorem 3.13(d) with  $T_k$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  in place of  $T$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  to obtain

$$\int_{B_{3/4}(0)} \frac{|w_i(x) - \lambda + \Lambda_i \kappa|^2}{|(x, y) - (0, \zeta)|^{n+3/2}} \leq C$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, M) \in (0, \infty)$  and thus by (3.160) we must have that  $\lambda - \Lambda_i \kappa = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq p$ . Hence  $\Lambda_i \kappa = \Lambda_j \kappa$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq p$ , which by (3.150) implies that  $\kappa = 0$ , and thus  $\lambda = 0$ . Therefore,  $\chi_k/\widetilde{Q}_k \rightarrow \lambda = 0$  and  $\widehat{E}_k \xi_k/\widetilde{Q}_k \rightarrow \kappa = 0$ , contradicting (3.159).  $\square$

**Corollary 3.17.** *Let  $2 \leq p_0 \leq q$  be integers such that either  $p_0 = 2$  or  $p_0 > 2$  and (H6) holds true. Given  $M \in [1, \infty)$  and  $\delta > 0$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \eta_0 \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m, q, p_0, M, \delta$  such that if  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis ( $\star$ ), Hypothesis ( $\star\star$ ), and Hypothesis ( $\dagger$ ) and  $Z = (\chi, \xi, \zeta) \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  such that  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ , then*

$$(3.161) \quad |\chi|^2 + \widehat{E}^2 |\xi|^2 \leq \delta^2 \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0))^2,$$

where  $\widehat{E} = E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ .

*Proof.* Corollary 3.17 follows from Lemma 3.14 and Lemma 3.15 in the same way that [Wic14, Lemma 10.4] follows from [Wic14, Lemma 10.6] and [Wic14, Proposition 10.7].  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.13.* We proceed by induction. Suppose that  $p_0 \in \{2, 3, \dots, q\}$  such that either  $p_0 = 2$  or  $p_0 > 2$  and (H6) holds true. We want to show that the conclusion of Theorem 3.13 holds true when  $p = p_0$ . Arguing as in [Wic14, Proposition 10.5] using Theorem 3.11(c), Corollary 3.17, (3.146), and (3.147), for every  $\rho \in (0, 1/4]$  and every  $\varepsilon, \beta, \eta \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \eta_0 \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m, q, M, \rho, \varepsilon, \beta, \eta$  such that if  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q, p_0}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypotheses  $(\star)$ ,  $(\star\star)$ , and  $(\dagger)$  and if  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ , then  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\eta_{Z, \rho\#} T$  satisfy Hypotheses  $(\star)$ ,  $(\star\star)$ , and  $(\dagger)$  with  $\varepsilon, \beta, \eta, C(n, m, q) M$  in place of  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \eta_0, M$ . In particular, by Corollary 3.10

$$(3.162) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_{3\rho/4}(Z)} \frac{\text{dist}^2(X - Z, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X)}{|X - Z|^{n+2-\sigma}} \leq C\rho^{-n-2+\sigma} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X - Z, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X)$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$ .

Now the conclusion of Theorem 3.13 follows by arguing as in [Wic04, Lemma 6.21]. Let  $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket$  where  $q_i \geq 1$  are integers such that  $\sum_{i=1}^p q_i = q$  and  $P_i$  are  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes given by (3.138) for some  $m \times 2$  matrix  $A_i$  satisfying (3.139). Let  $0 < \tau < \gamma < 1$  and, assuming  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \eta_0$  are sufficiently small, let  $T_i$  be as in Theorem 3.11(b). Note that given  $\delta > 0$  and assuming  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \eta_0$  are sufficiently small depending on  $n, m, q, p_0, M, \delta$ , by Lemma 3.17, (3.138), and (3.139),

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), (Z + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |A_i \xi - \chi| \leq C\delta \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q, p'}}$$

$$Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0)).$$

Thus by Theorem 3.11(a)(b), provided we take  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, p_0, M, \tau)$  to be sufficiently small, for each  $X \in \text{spt } T_i$  the closest point  $X'$  to  $X$  on  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C}$  lies on  $P_i$  and the closest point to  $X$  on  $Z + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}$  lies on  $Z + P_i$ . Hence

$$\text{dist}(X, Z + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) = |X' - X - \pi_{P_i^\perp}(\chi, \xi, 0)|$$

(as in (6.31) of [Wic04]). The main change from [Wic04, Lemma 6.21] is that we obtain (6.34) of [Wic04] as follows: we want to show that for some  $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$

$$(3.163) \quad |\pi_{P_{i_0}^\perp}(\chi, \xi, 0)| \geq c \widehat{E} |(\chi, \xi)|$$

for some constant  $c = c(n, m, q, M) > 0$ . Suppose to the contrary that  $|\pi_{P_i^\perp}(\chi, \xi, 0)| < \widehat{E} |(\chi, \xi)|$  for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ . By taking  $P = P_i$  to be one of the planes of  $\mathbf{C}$  in (3.144) and using (3.7),

$$\widehat{E} \leq CM \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_j \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq CM \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \inf_{X \in P_i \cap (\mathbf{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}(X, P_j),$$

where  $\widehat{E} = E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Thus there exists  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  such that

$$|\pi_{P_i^\perp}(\chi, \xi, 0) - \pi_{P_j^\perp}(\chi, \xi, 0)| \geq |\pi_{P_i}(\chi, \xi, 0) - \pi_{P_j}(\chi, \xi, 0)| \geq 2c \widehat{E} |(\chi, \xi)|$$

for some constant  $c = c(n, m, q, M) > 0$ . Therefore (3.163) holds true for either  $i_0 = i$  or  $i_0 = j$ . Now let  $\rho_0 = \rho_0(n, m, q, p_0, M) \in (0, 1/8]$  and  $\tau = \tau(n, m, q, p_0, M, \rho_0) \in (0, \rho_0/2]$  be constants to be later determined. Provided  $\tau$  is sufficiently small, there exists a  $\|T_{i_0}\|$ -measurable set  $S \subset \text{spt } T_{i_0} \cap \mathbf{B}_{\rho_0}(Z) \cap \{|x| > \tau\}$  such that  $\|T_{i_0}\|(S) \geq \frac{1}{2} \omega_n \rho_0^n$ . Integrating (3.163) over  $S$  gives us

$$(3.164) \quad \widehat{E}^2 |(\chi, \xi)|^2 \leq \frac{C}{\rho_0^n} \sum_{i=1}^p \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\rho_0}(Z) \cap \{|x| > \tau\}} |\pi_{P_i^\perp}(\chi, \xi, 0)|^2 d\|T_i\|(X)$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0, M) \in (0, \infty)$ . Inequality (6.34) of [Wic04] follows from (3.164) and (6.35) of [Wic04].  $\square$

**Corollary 3.18.** *For all  $\delta \in (0, 1/4)$ ,  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ , and  $M \in [1, \infty)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \eta_0 \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m, q, M, \delta, \sigma$  such that if  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , and Hypothesis  $(\dagger)$  and if*

$$\mathbf{B}_\delta(0, y_0) \cap \{X \in \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0) : \Theta(T, X) \geq q\} \neq \emptyset$$

for all  $y_0 \in B_{1/2}^{n-2}(0)$ , then

$$(3.165) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)} \frac{\text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C})}{r_\delta^{2-\sigma}} d\|T\|(X) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X),$$

where  $r_\delta = \max\{|x|, \delta\}$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, M, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant (independent of  $\delta$ ).

*Proof.* This follows from Theorem 3.13 by arguing as in the proof of [Sim93, Corollary 3.2].  $\square$

**3.5. A priori estimates for area-minimizers not close to a plane.** Here we will consider the case where, in contrast with Hypothesis  $(\dagger)$ ,  $T$  is not close to a  $n$ -dimensional plane. Thus, given a constant  $\eta_0 \in (0, 1)$ , we shall assume that:

**Hypothesis  $(\dagger\dagger)$ .** For  $q \geq 2$  an integer and  $T$  an  $n$ -dimensional locally area-minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with  $T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0$ , suppose that

$$(3.166) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(T, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \geq \eta_0.$$

We shall represent points  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  by  $X = (x, y)$  where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{m+2}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Let  $p$  be an integer with  $2 \leq p \leq q$ , and let  $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  and suppose that  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , and Hypothesis  $(\dagger\dagger)$ . By the triangle inequality, the assumption  $\|T\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq (q+1/2)\omega_n$ , and (3.5), we have that for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_i) d\|T\|(X) \\ & \leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) + 2(q+1/2)\omega_n \sup_{X \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_i) \\ & \leq 2\beta_0^2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_i) d\|T\|(X) + 2(q+1/2)\omega_n \sup_{X \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_i). \end{aligned}$$

Hence assuming  $\beta_0 < 1/2$  and using (3.132),

$$(3.167) \quad \eta_0^2 \leq \frac{1}{\omega_n} \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_i) d\|T\|(X) \leq 4(q+1/2) \sup_{X \in \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_i) \\ \leq 4(q+1/2) \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_i \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_j \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)).$$

We wish to obtain estimates similar to those of Corollary 3.12, Theorem 3.13, and Corollary 3.18 in this setting.

First, as a consequence of Theorem 3.9 and Theorem 3.4, we have:

**Corollary 3.19.** *For each  $0 < \tau < \gamma < 1$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0 \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m, q, \gamma, \tau$  such that if  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$  and Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , then:*

$$(3.168) \quad \sum_{i=1}^p \int_{\mathbf{B}_\gamma(0, P_i) \cap \{r > \tau\}} R^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial(u_i/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X),$$

where  $R(x, y) = |(x, y)|$ ,  $u_i : B_\gamma(0, P_i) \cap \{r > \tau\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(P_i^\perp)$  are as in Theorem 3.4(c), and  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant.

*Proof.* Let  $(x', y)$  denote points on  $P_i$ , where  $x' \in P_i \cap (\mathbb{R}^{m+2} \times \{0\})$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . For each  $(x', y) \in B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \tau\}$  let  $u_i(x', y) = \sum_{j=1}^{q_i} \llbracket u_{i,j}(x', y) \rrbracket$  where  $u_{i,j}(x', y) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Arguing as in the proof of Corollary 3.12, for  $\mathcal{H}^n$ -a.e.  $(x', y) \in K_i$  at the point  $(x, y) = (x', y) + u_{i,j}(x', y)$

$$|(x, y)^\perp| \geq \frac{1}{2} R^2 \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial R} \left( \frac{u_{i,j}(x', y)}{R} \right) \right|.$$

Now (3.168) follows from Theorem 3.9 and Theorem 3.4(c).  $\square$

Next we derive a priori estimates based on [Sim93, Theorem 3.1] and [Wic14, Corollary 10.2].

**Theorem 3.20.** *For all integers  $p, q$  with  $2 \leq p \leq q$ , each  $\eta_0 \in (0, 1)$ , each  $\tau, \gamma$  with  $0 < \tau < \gamma < 1$ , and each  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0 \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m, q, p, \eta_0, \gamma, \tau, \sigma$  such that the following holds true. Suppose that  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , and Hypothesis  $(\dagger\dagger)$ . Let  $Z = (\xi, \zeta) \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  be such that  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad & |\xi|^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X), \\ (b) \quad & \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(Z)} \text{dist}(X - Z, \text{spt } \mathbf{C})^2 d\|T\|(X) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, p) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant (independent of  $\tau$ ). Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} (c) \quad & \int_{B_\gamma(0)} \frac{\text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X)}{|X - Z|^{n+2-\sigma}} \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X), \\ (d) \quad & \int_{B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \tau\}} \frac{|u_i(x, y) - \pi_{P_i^\perp} \xi|^2}{|(x, y) - (\xi, \zeta)|^{n+2-\sigma}} \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) \text{ for all } i \end{aligned}$$

where  $u_i : B_\gamma(0, P_i) \cap \{r > \tau\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(P_i^\perp)$  are as in Theorem 3.11(c) and  $C = C(n, m, q, p, \gamma, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant (independent of  $\tau$ ).

The proof of Theorem 3.20 is similar to that of Theorem 3.13 above. We shall assume the inductive hypothesis that  $p_0 \in \{2, 3, \dots, q\}$  such that either  $p_0 = 2$  or  $p_0 > 2$  and

(H7) Theorem 3.20 holds true for all  $p \in \{2, 3, \dots, p_0 - 1\}$ .

Theorem 3.20 in the case  $p = p_0$  will follow from two preliminary results Lemma 3.21 and Corollary 3.22. Note that by Theorem 3.4(a), for each  $\tau > 0$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\tau) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\beta_0 = \beta_0(\tau) \in (0, 1)$  with  $\varepsilon_0(\tau) \rightarrow 0^+$  and  $\beta_0(\tau) \rightarrow 0^+$  as  $\tau \rightarrow 0^+$  such that if  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$  and Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$  and  $Z = (\xi, \zeta) \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  such that  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$  then

$$(3.169) \quad |\xi| \leq \tau.$$

**Lemma 3.21.** *Let  $2 \leq p_0 \leq q$  be integers such that either  $p_0 = 2$  or  $p_0 > 2$  and (H7) holds true. Given  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  and  $\delta > 0$  there exists  $\varepsilon, \beta, \gamma \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m, q, p_0, \eta, \delta$  such that the following holds true. Let  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , and Hypothesis  $(\dagger\dagger)$  with  $\varepsilon, \beta, \eta$  in place of  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \eta_0$ . Let  $Z = (\xi, \zeta) \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  be such that  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ . Suppose that for some  $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, p_0 - 1\}$  either  $s = 1$  or  $s > 1$  and*

$$(3.170) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^s \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq \gamma \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{s-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0)).$$



Then

$$(3.171) \quad |\xi| \leq \delta \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^s \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0)).$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.21.* The proof is similar to that of [Wic14, Proposition 10.7] with some minor changes and we sketch the proof for completion. Without loss of generality, fix  $\eta, \delta > 0$  and  $1 \leq s < p_0 \leq q$ . Suppose to the contrary that for  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  there exists  $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\beta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\gamma_k \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p_0}$ , and a locally area minimizing rectifiable current  $T_k$  of  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  such that Hypothesis ( $\star$ ), Hypothesis ( $\star\star$ ), and Hypothesis ( $\dagger\dagger$ ) hold true with  $\varepsilon_k, \beta_k, \gamma_k, \eta, \mathbf{C}_k, T_k$  in place of  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0, \gamma_0, \eta_0, \mathbf{C}, T$  but for some  $Z_k = (\chi_k, \xi_k, \zeta_k) \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  such that  $\Theta(T_k, Z_k) \geq q$

$$(3.172) \quad |\xi_k|^2 \geq \delta^2 \tilde{Q}_k^2,$$

where  $\tilde{Q}_k = \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^s \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ . Note that by (3.169), we know that  $\xi_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus by (3.172) we must have that  $\tilde{Q}_k \rightarrow 0^+$ . Moreover, by Hypothesis ( $\dagger\dagger$ ) we must have that  $s \geq 2$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,s}$  such that  $Q(T_k, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq 2\tilde{Q}_k$ . Express  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  as  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k = \sum_{i=1}^p \tilde{q}_i \llbracket \tilde{P}_i^{(k)} \rrbracket$  where  $\tilde{q}_i$  are integers with  $\sum_{i=1}^p \tilde{q}_i = q$  and  $\tilde{P}_i^{(k)}$  are  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  with  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset \tilde{P}_i^{(k)}$ . After passing to a subsequence, assume  $\tilde{q}_i$  are independent of  $k$  and find  $n$ -dimensional planes  $\tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)}$  such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\tilde{P}_i^{(k)} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) = 0.$$

Thus we can regard  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  as converging weakly to  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_\infty = \sum_{i=1}^p \tilde{q}_i \llbracket \tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)} \rrbracket$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  for an appropriate choice of orientation of  $\tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)}$ . Let  $\tau_k \rightarrow 0^+$  and  $u_i^{(k)} : B_{3/4}(0, \tilde{P}_i^{(k)}) \cap \{r > \tau_k\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}((\tilde{P}_i^{(k)})^\perp)$  be as in Theorem 3.4(c) with  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k, T_k, u_i^{(k)}$  in place of  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}, T, u_i$ . Let  $\mathbf{q}_i^{(k)} : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  be an orthogonal linear transformation such that

$$\mathbf{q}_i^{(k)}(\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}) = \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}, \quad \mathbf{q}_i^{(k)}(\tilde{P}_i^{(k)}) = \tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)}, \quad \mathbf{q}_i^{(k)}((\tilde{P}_i^{(k)})^\perp) = (\tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)})^\perp.$$

After passing to a subsequence, blow-up  $T_k$  relative to  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  by letting  $(\mathbf{q}_i^{(k)} \circ u_i^{(k)} \circ (\mathbf{q}_i^{(k)})^{-1}) / \tilde{Q}_k \rightarrow w_i$  in  $L^2(B_{3/4}(0, \tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)}) \cap \{r > \sigma\}, \mathcal{A}_{q_i}((\tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)})^\perp))$  for each  $\sigma > 0$ . By Theorem 3.4(c) and (3.5),  $w_i$  is also a blow-up of  $\mathbf{C}_k$  relative to  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  and in particular

$$(3.173) \quad w_i(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{q_i} \llbracket \psi_{i,j}(x) \rrbracket.$$

for each  $(x, y) \in \tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)}$ , where  $\psi_{i,j} : \tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)} \cap (\mathbb{R}^{m+2} \times \{0\}) \rightarrow (\tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)})^\perp$  are linear maps (not necessarily distinct). By (H7) we can apply Theorem 3.20(a) with  $T_k$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  in place of  $T$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  to obtain  $|\xi_k| \leq C\tilde{Q}_k$  for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0) \in (0, \infty)$ . After passing to a subsequence let  $\xi_k / \tilde{Q}_k \rightarrow \kappa$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  and  $\zeta_k \rightarrow \zeta$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . By (H7), we can apply Theorem 3.13(d) with  $T_k$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  in place of  $T$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  to obtain

$$\int_{B_{3/4}(0)} \frac{|w_i(x) - \pi_{(\tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)})^\perp}(\kappa, 0)|^2}{|(x, y) - (0, \zeta)|^{n+3/2}} \leq C$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, p_0) \in (0, \infty)$  and thus by (3.173) we must have that  $\pi_{(\tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)})^\perp} \kappa = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq p$ . In other words,  $(\kappa, 0) \in \tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)}$  for all  $i$ . However, by (3.167) and (3.7) with  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  in

place of  $\mathbf{C}$ , after passing to a subsequence there exists  $i \neq j$  such that

$$\inf_{X \in \tilde{P}_i^{(k)} \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}(X, \tilde{P}_j^{(k)}) \geq c\eta$$

for some constant  $c = c(n, m, q) > 0$ . Thus letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\inf_{X \in \tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)} \cap (\mathbb{S}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})} \text{dist}(X, \tilde{P}_j^{(\infty)}) \geq c\eta$$

for some constant  $c = c(n, m, q) > 0$ . That is,  $\tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)} \cap \tilde{P}_j^{(\infty)} = \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Since  $(\kappa, 0) \in \tilde{P}_i^{(\infty)} \cap \tilde{P}_j^{(\infty)}$ , we must have that  $\kappa = 0$ . Therefore,  $\xi_k / \tilde{Q}_k \rightarrow \kappa = 0$ , contradicting (3.172).  $\square$

**Corollary 3.22.** *Let  $2 \leq p_0 \leq q$  be integers such that either  $p_0 = 2$  or  $p_0 > 2$  and (H7) holds true. Given  $\eta_0 \in (0, 1)$  and  $\delta > 0$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0 \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m, q, p_0, \eta_0, \delta$  such that if  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , and Hypothesis  $(\dagger\dagger)$  and if  $Z = (\xi, \zeta) \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  is such that  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ , then*

$$(3.174) \quad |\xi| \leq \delta \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p_0-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}}$$

*Proof.* Corollary 3.22 follows from Lemma 3.21 in much the same way that [Wic14, Lemma 10.4] follows from [Wic14, Lemma 10.6] and [Wic14, Proposition 10.7].  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.20.* We proceed by induction. Suppose that  $p_0 \in \{2, 3, \dots, q\}$  such that either  $p_0 = 2$  or  $p_0 > 2$  and (H7) holds true. We want to show that the conclusion of Theorem 3.20 holds true when  $p = p_0$ . We claim that for every  $\rho \in (0, 1/4]$  and every  $\eta_0, \varepsilon, \beta \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0 \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m, q, \rho$  such that if  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p_0}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypotheses  $(\star)$ ,  $(\star\star)$ , and  $(\dagger\dagger)$  and if  $Z \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  with  $\Theta(T, Z) \geq q$ , then  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\eta_{Z,\rho\#}T$  satisfy Hypotheses  $(\star)$  and  $(\star\star)$  with  $\varepsilon, \beta$  in place of  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0$ . Hypotheses  $(\star)$  is readily verified using (3.169). Hypotheses  $(\star\star)$  is verified by arguing as in [Wic14, Proposition 10.5] using Theorem 3.11(c) and Corollary 3.22. Hence by Corollary 3.10, (3.162) holds true.

Now let  $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket$  where  $q_i \geq 1$  are integers such that  $\sum_{i=1}^p q_i = q$  and  $P_i$  are  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes with  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset P_i$ . Let  $0 < \tau < \gamma < 1$  and, assuming  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0$  are sufficiently small, let  $T_i$  be as in Theorem 3.4(b). Arguing as we did for Theorem 3.13, it follows using Theorem 3.4 and Lemma 3.22 that for each  $X \in \text{spt } T_i$  the closest point  $X'$  to  $X$  on  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C}$  lies on  $P_i$  and the closest point to  $X$  on  $Z + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}$  lies on  $Z + P_i$ . Hence

$$(3.175) \quad \text{dist}(X, Z + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) = |X' - X - \pi_{P_i^\perp}(\xi, 0)|$$

In particular, since  $\text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) = |X' - X|$ ,

$$(3.176) \quad |\pi_{P_i^\perp}(\xi, 0)| \leq \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) + \text{dist}(X, Z + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}),$$

$$(3.177) \quad |\text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) - \text{dist}(X, Z + \text{spt } \mathbf{C})| \leq |\xi|.$$

By (3.7) and (3.167) there exists  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  such that

$$|\pi_{P_i^\perp}(\xi, 0) - \pi_{P_j^\perp}(\xi, 0)| \geq |\pi_{P_i}(\xi, 0) - \pi_{P_j}(\chi, \xi, 0)| \geq 2c\eta |\xi|$$

for some constant  $c = c(n, m, q) > 0$ . Thus for  $i_0 = i$  or  $i_0 = j$

$$(3.178) \quad |\pi_{P_{i_0}^\perp}(\xi, 0)| \geq c\eta |\xi|.$$

Let  $\rho_0 = \rho_0(n, m, q, p_0) \in (0, 1/8]$  and  $\tau = \tau(n, m, q, p_0, \rho_0) \in (0, \rho_0/2]$  be constants to be later determined. Provided  $\tau$  is sufficiently small, there exists a  $\|T_{i_0}\|$ -measurable set  $S \subset \text{spt } T_{i_0} \cap \mathbf{B}_{\rho_0}(Z) \cap \{|x| > \tau\}$  such that  $\|T_{i_0}\|(S) \geq \frac{1}{2} \omega_n \rho_0^n$ . Integrating (3.178) over  $S$  and arguing as

in [Sim93, Lemma 3.9] using (3.162), (3.176), and (3.177) prove (a) and (b). Arguing as in [Sim93, Theorem 3.1] again using (3.162), (3.175), and (3.177) proves (c) and (d).  $\square$

**Corollary 3.23.** *For all  $\eta_0 \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\delta \in (0, 1/4)$ , and  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$  there exists  $\varepsilon_0, \beta_0 \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m, q, \eta_0, \delta, \sigma$  such that if  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $T$  satisfy Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , and Hypothesis  $(\dagger\dagger)$  and if*

$$\mathbf{B}_\delta(0, y_0) \cap \{X \in \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0) : \Theta(T, X) \geq q\} \neq \emptyset$$

for all  $y_0 \in B_{1/2}^{n-2}(0)$ , then

$$(3.179) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)} \frac{\text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C})}{r_\delta^{2-\sigma}} d\|T\|(X) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X),$$

where  $r_\delta = \max\{|x|, \delta\}$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant (independent of  $\delta$ ).

*Proof.* The estimate (3.179) follows from Theorem 3.20 by arguing as in the proof of [Sim93, Corollary 3.2].  $\square$

#### 4. FINE BLOW-UPS AND DECAY OF FINE EXCESS

**4.1. Preliminaries, fine blow up class and notation.** Let  $q$  be an integer  $\geq 2$ ,  $M \geq 1$  and let  $(\epsilon_k), (\beta_k), (\eta_k)$  be sequences of positive numbers converging to 0. For each  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , let  $T_k$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with  $(\partial T_k) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0$  and let  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q, p_k}$ , where  $p_k$  is an integer with  $2 \leq p_k \leq q$ , such that Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\dagger)$  and conditions (3.135) and (3.140) hold true with  $T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, p_k, \epsilon_k, \beta_k, \eta_k$  in place of  $T, \mathbf{C}, p, \epsilon, \beta, \eta$  respectively. Thus, for each  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , we suppose:

- (1)  $\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{i=1}^{p_k} q_i^{(k)} \llbracket P_i^{(k)} \rrbracket$  where for each  $k$  and  $1 \leq i \leq p_k$ ,  $P_i^{(k)}$  are distinct  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes with  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \subset P_i^{(k)}$  and orienting  $n$ -vector  $\vec{P}_i^{(k)}$ , and  $q_i^{(k)}, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p_k\}$ , are positive integers with  $\sum_{i=1}^{p_k} q_i^{(k)} = q$ ;
- (2)  $(\partial T_k) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0$ ,  $\Theta(T_k, 0) \geq q$ ,  $\|T_k\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) < (q + 1/2)\omega_n$ ;
- (3)  $0 < E_k = E(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \epsilon_k$ ;
- (4)  $Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \beta_k \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \cup_{p'=1}^{p_k-1} \mathcal{C}_{q, p'}} Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ ;
- (5)  $E(T_k, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \eta_k$ ;
- (6)  $E(T_k, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq M \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q, 1}} E(T_k, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ ;
- (7)  $\pi_{P_0 \#} (T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{7/8}) \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0) = q \llbracket P_0 \rrbracket \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0)$ ;
- (8)  $|\vec{P}_i^{(k)} - \vec{P}_0| < 1/2$ .

Suppose further that for each  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , there is  $\delta_k > 0$  with  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$  such that

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbf{B}_{\delta_k}(0, z) \cap \{Z : \Theta(T_k, Z) \geq q\} \neq \emptyset$$

for each point  $(0, z) \in \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \cap B_{1/2}(0)$ .

Let  $(\tau_k)$  be a sequences of decreasing positive numbers converging to 0, and let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ . By passing to appropriate subsequences of  $(T_k)$ ,  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$ , and possibly replacing  $\mathbf{C}_k$  with a cone  $\mathbf{C}'_k$  with  $\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'_k\| = \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|$  without changing notation (see Remark 3.3), we find an integer  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ , and for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , integers  $q_i \geq 1$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^p q_i = q$  such that (1)-(8) above hold with  $p_k = p$  and  $q_i^{(k)} = q_i$  for each  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ ; furthermore, we find that the assertions (A)-(E) below hold for each  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ :

(A) Writing  $\widehat{E}_k = E(T_k, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$  and  $P_i^{(k)} = \{(z, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : z = A_i^{(k)}x\}$  for some  $m \times 2$  matrices  $A_i^{(k)}$ , we have by (3.139), (3.141), (3.142) and (3.147) that

$$(4.2) \quad \|A_i^{(k)}\| \leq C\widehat{E}_k,$$

$$(4.3) \quad \min_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{S}^1} |A_i^{(k)}x - A_j^{(k)}x| \geq c \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_{p'}}, Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0)),$$

$$(4.4) \quad \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{S}^1} |A_i^{(k)}x - A_j^{(k)}x| \geq \frac{c}{M}\widehat{E}_k,$$

$$(4.5) \quad \|A_i^{(k)} - A_j^{(k)}\| \leq C \inf_{x \in \mathbb{S}^1} |A_i^{(k)}x - A_j^{(k)}x| \text{ for all } 1 \leq i < j \leq p,$$

where  $c = c(n, m, q)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q)$ .

(B) By Corollary 3.18,

$$(4.6) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \cap \{(x^1, x^2) | \langle \delta \rangle\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|T_k\|(X) \leq C\delta^{3/2}E_k^2$$

for each  $\delta \in [\delta_k, 1/4]$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q, M) \in (0, \infty)$ .

(C) By Theorem 3.11, for  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , there exists an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current  $T_i^{(k)}$  of  $\mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \{r > \tau_k/4\}$  such that:

(a)

$$(4.7) \quad T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_{(7+\gamma)/8}(0) \cap \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \{r > \tau_k/4\} = \sum_{i=1}^p T_i^{(k)},$$

$$(\partial T_i^{(k)}) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{(3+\gamma)/4}(0) \cap \{r > \tau_k/4\} = 0,$$

$$(\pi_{P_0 \#} T_i^{(k)}) \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \cap \{r > \tau_k/2\} = q_i \llcorner P_0 \llcorner \mathbf{C}_{(1+\gamma)/2}(0) \cap \{r > \tau_k/2\},$$

$$\sup_{X \in \text{spt } T_i^{(k)} \cap \{r > \sigma\}} \text{dist}(X, P_i^{(k)}) \leq C_\sigma E_k \text{ for all } \sigma \in [\tau_k/2, 1/2],$$

where  $r(X) = \text{dist}(X, \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})$  and  $C_\sigma = C_\sigma(n, m, q, \gamma, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant;

(b) for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  there exists a Lipschitz  $q_i$ -valued function  $u_i^{(k)} : B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \tau_k\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  and a measurable set  $K_i^{(k)} \subseteq B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \tau_k\}$  such that

$$(4.8) \quad T_i^{(k)} \llcorner (\mathbb{R}^m \times K_i^{(k)}) = \text{graph}(A_i^{(k)}x + u_i^{(k)}) \cap (\mathbb{R}^m \times K_i^{(k)}),$$

$$\mathcal{L}^n(B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \sigma\} \setminus K_i^{(k)}) + \|T_i^{(k)}\|(\mathbb{R}^m \times (B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \sigma\} \setminus K_i^{(k)})) \leq C_\sigma E_k^{2+\alpha},$$

$$\sup_{B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \sigma\}} |u_i^{(k)}| \leq C_\sigma E_k, \quad \sup_{B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \sigma\}} |\nabla u_i^{(k)}| \leq C_\sigma E_k^\alpha$$

for all  $\sigma \in [\tau_k, 1/2]$ , where  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $C_\sigma = C_\sigma(n, m, q, \gamma, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants.

(D) By Theorem 3.13, for each point  $Z = (\chi, \xi, \zeta) \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  with  $\Theta(T_k, Z) \geq q$ ,

$$(4.9) \quad |\chi|^2 + \widehat{E}_k^2 |\xi|^2 \leq C E_k^2$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, M) \in (0, \infty)$ . Furthermore, by Theorem 3.9, Corollary 3.12 and Theorem 3.13, for each  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  and sufficiently large  $k$  depending on  $\rho$ , and for each point  $Z = (\chi, \xi, \zeta) \in \text{spt } T_k \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  with  $\Theta(T_k, Z) \geq q$ ,

(E)

$$(4.10) \quad \int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(0) \cap \{r > \tau_k\}} R^{2-n} \left( \frac{\partial(u_i^{(k)}/R)}{\partial R} \right)^2 + \rho^{-n} \int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(0) \cap \{r > \tau_k\}} |D_y u_i^{(k)}|^2 \\ \leq C \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|T_k\|$$

$$(4.11) \quad \int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(\xi, \zeta) \cap \{r > \tau_k\}} \frac{|u_i^{(k)}(x, y) - (\chi - A_i^{(k)}\xi)|^2}{|(u_i^{(k)}(x, y) - \chi, x - \xi, y - \zeta)|^{n+2-\sigma}} \\ \leq C_1 \rho^{-n-2+\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m \times B_\rho(\xi, \zeta)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\nu_Z \# \mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|T_k\|$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , where  $R(X) = |X|$ ;  $\nu_Z$  is the translation  $X \mapsto X + Z$ ;  $C = C(n, m, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q, M, \gamma, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants; and, writing

$$u_i^{(k)}(x, y) = \sum_{\kappa=1}^{q_i} [u_{i,\kappa}^{(k)}(x, y)]$$

with  $u_{i,\kappa}^{(k)}(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , the integrand on the left hand side of (4.11) is the single-valued function  $(x, y) \mapsto \sum_{\kappa=1}^{q_i} \frac{|u_{i,\kappa}^{(k)}(x, y) - (\chi - A_i^{(k)}\xi)|^2}{|(u_{i,\kappa}^{(k)}(x, y) - \chi, x - \xi, y - \zeta)|^{n+2-\sigma}}$ .

Extend  $u_i^{(k)}$  to all of  $B_\gamma(0)$  by setting  $u_i^{(k)}(x, y) = q_i[0]$  for  $(x, y) \in B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r \leq \tau_k\}$ .

By (4.2) and (4.4), for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  there exists an  $m \times 2$  matrix  $A_i$  such that, after passing to a subsequence of  $(k)$  without changing notation,

$$(4.12) \quad \widehat{E}_k^{-1} A_i^{(k)} \rightarrow A_i$$

for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ , and

$$(4.13) \quad \|A_i\| \leq C;$$

$$(4.14) \quad \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{S}^1} |A_i x - A_j x| \geq c/M$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $c = c(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ ; hence in particular there exist  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  with  $i \neq j$  such that  $A_i - A_j$  has rank 2.

By (C) above, Theorem 2.10 and Lemma 2.11, there exist locally Dirichlet energy minimizing functions  $w_i : B_\gamma(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  such that, writing  $v_i^{(k)} = E_k^{-1} u_i^{(k)}$  and passing to a subsequence of  $(k)$  without changing notation, we have

$$(4.15) \quad \int_K \mathcal{G}(v_i^{(k)}, w_i)^2 + (|Dv_i^{(k)}| - |Dw_i|)^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

for each compact set  $K \subset B_\gamma(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . From (4.6) it follows that  $\int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \cap \{0 < r < \sigma\}} |u_i^{(k)}|^2 \leq C\sigma^{1/2} E_k^2$  and consequently that  $\int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \cap \{0 < r < \sigma\}} |w_i|^2 \leq C\sigma^{1/2}$  for each  $\sigma \in (0, 1/4)$ , where  $C =$

$C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ , and hence that  $w_i \in L^2(B_{1/2}(0); \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m))$  and that

$$v_i^{(k)} \rightarrow w_i \quad \text{in } L^2(B_{1/2}(0); \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)).$$

Taking a sequence  $\gamma_\ell \rightarrow 1^-$  and applying this procedure with  $\gamma_\ell$  in place of  $\gamma$ , in conjunction with a diagonal subsequence argument to select a further subsequence of  $(k)$  without relabeling, we obtain, for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ , a locally Dirichlet energy minimizing function  $w_i : B_1(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  such that

$$(4.16) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \mathcal{G}(v_i^{(k)}, w_i)^2 + \int_K (|Dv_i^{(k)}| - |Dw_i|)^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

for each compact set  $K \subset B_1(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Furthermore, we have by (C) and (4.6) that for each  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  and each  $\sigma \in (0, \rho/8)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{\rho-\sigma}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p |w_i|^2 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k^{-2} \int_{\mathbf{C}_{\rho-\sigma}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|T_k\| \\ & \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k^{-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|T_k\| \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k^{-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|T_k\| \\ & \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k^{-2} \int_{\mathbf{C}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|T_k\| = \int_{B_\rho(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p |w_i|^2, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$(4.17) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k^{-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|T_k\| = \int_{B_\rho} \sum_{i=1}^p |w_i|^2;$$

hence in particular  $\omega_n^{-1} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} |w_i|^2 \leq 1$ , and we have that

$$(4.18) \quad w_i \in L^2(B_{1/2}(0); \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)) \cap W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_1(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}; \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, p, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\omega_n^{-1} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p |w_i|^2 \leq 1.$$

**Definition 4.1** (fine blow-up). *Fix integers  $q \geq 2$ ,  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$  and  $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_p \geq 1$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^p q_j = q$ , and write  $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_p)$ . Let  $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_p)$ , where for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ :*

- (a)  $w_i \in L^2(B_{1/2}(0); \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)) \cap W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_1(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}; \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m))$ ;
- (b)  $w_i$  is as in (4.16), so that  $w_i$  arises in the manner described above, corresponding to (a subsequence of) a sequence  $(T_k)$  of  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable currents in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$ , a sequence of cones  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$  with  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$ , sequences of positive numbers  $(\epsilon_k)$ ,  $(\beta_k)$ ,  $(\eta_k)$ ,  $(\delta_k)$  converging to 0, satisfying, for some  $M \geq 1$  (independent of  $k$ ), every  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  and sufficiently large  $k$  (depending on  $\gamma$ ):
  - (i) Hypothesis  $(\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$ , Hypothesis  $(\dagger)$  and conditions (3.135) and (3.140) with  $T_k$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k$ ,  $\epsilon_k$ ,  $\beta_k$ ,  $\eta_k$  in place of  $T$ ,  $\mathbf{C}$ ,  $\epsilon$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\eta$  respectively (or equivalently, after possibly reversing orientation of  $T_k$  and of  $\mathbf{C}_k$ , conditions (1)-(8) above with  $p_k = p$  and  $q_i^{(k)} = q_i$  for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $i = 1, \dots, p$ ), and
  - (ii) condition (4.1).

We call  $w$  a *fine blow-up* of the sequence  $(T_k)$  relative to  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$ .

**Definition 4.2** (fine blow-up classes). *With  $q, p, \mathbf{q}$  as in Definition 4.1 above, and for  $M \geq 1$ , we let  $\mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(M)$  denote the set of all functions  $w = (w_1, \dots, w_p)$  with  $w_i \in L^2(B_{1/2}(0); \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)) \cap W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_1(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}; \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m))$  such that  $w$  is a fine blow-up, per Definition 4.1, of a sequences of currents  $(T_k)$  relative to a sequences of cones  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$ , where  $M$  corresponds to  $(T_k)$  as in condition (6) above.*

*Given  $m \times 2$  matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_p$  and  $M \geq 1$ , we let  $\mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(M, A_1, \dots, A_p)$  denote the set of all  $w \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(M)$  such that  $w$  is a fine blow-up, per Definition 4.1, of a sequences of currents  $(T_k)$  relative to a sequence of cones  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$  with  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ , where:*

- $M$  corresponds to  $(T_k)$  as in condition (6) above, and
- the  $m \times 2$  matrices  $A_1^{(k)}, \dots, A_p^{(k)}$  corresponding to  $\mathbf{C}_k$  (as in (A) above) satisfy

$$\hat{E}_k^{-1} A_i^{(k)} \rightarrow A_i$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , where  $\hat{E}_k = E(T_k, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ .

**Remark 4.3.** *By the discussion above, it follows that  $\mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(M, A_1, \dots, A_p)$  is defined only for matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_p$  satisfying (4.13) and (4.14).*

**Remark 4.4.** *Let  $q, p, \mathbf{q}$  be as in Definition 4.1, let  $M \geq 1$  and let  $w = (w_1, \dots, w_p) \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(M, A_1, \dots, A_p)$  where  $A_1, \dots, A_p$  are constant  $m \times 2$  matrices satisfying the requirements of Definition 4.2 for some sequences  $(T_k)$ ,  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$  of currents and cones giving rise to  $w$  per Definition 4.2. If  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  and  $w_i \not\equiv q_i \llbracket 0 \rrbracket$  in  $B_\rho(0)$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ , then*

$$\tilde{w} \equiv \|w(\rho(\cdot))\|_{L^2(B_1(0))}^{-1} w(\rho(\cdot)) \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(CM, A_1, \dots, A_p),$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q)$ ,  $\|w(\rho(\cdot))\|_{L^2(B_1(0))}^2 = \rho^{-n} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2$  and  $\tilde{w} = (\tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2, \dots, \tilde{w}_p)$  with  $\tilde{w}_j = \|w(\rho(\cdot))\|_{L^2(B_1(0))}^{-1} w_j(\rho(\cdot))$ ; indeed,  $E(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_\rho(0)) \neq 0$  for all sufficiently large  $k$ , and  $\tilde{w}$  is a fine blow up of the sequence  $\tilde{T}_k = \eta_{0,\rho\#} T_k$  relative to  $\mathbf{C}_k$ . To see this, note that by (4.17) we have that  $E(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_\rho(0)) \neq 0$  for all sufficiently large  $k$ . By assumption conditions (1)-(8) above (with  $p_k = p$ ) and condition (4.1) hold, and hence it is readily checked that conditions (1)-(3), (5), (7), (8) above and condition (4.1) are satisfied with  $\tilde{T}_k$  in place of  $T_k$  and with  $\rho^{-(n+2)/2} \varepsilon_k$ ,  $\rho^{-(n+2)/2} \eta_k$ ,  $\rho^{-1} \delta_k$  in place of  $\varepsilon_k$ ,  $\eta_k$ ,  $\delta_k$ ; by arguing as in [Wic14, pp. 910-914], using Theorem 3.11 in places where the argument depended on [Wic14, Theorem 10.1], we can also verify that condition (4) holds with  $\tilde{T}_k$  in place of  $T_k$  and  $C\rho^{-(n+2)/2} \beta_k$  in place of  $\beta_k$  where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ , and that condition (6) holds with  $\tilde{T}_k$  in place of  $T_k$  and  $CM$  in place of  $M$ , where again  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Hence we can construct a fine blow up of  $(\tilde{T}_k)$  relative to  $\mathbf{C}_k$ , which can readily be checked to be equal to  $\|w(\rho(\cdot))\|_{L^2(B_1(0))}^{-1} w(\rho(\cdot))$ .

In subsequent sections, we shall use the following notation:

- $\mathcal{S}$  denotes the subspace of  $(m+n) \times (m+n)$  skew symmetric matrices spanned by the set of skew symmetric matrices corresponding to the transformations  $\Gamma_{ij} : \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq 2+m$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n-2$ ) given by  $\Gamma_{ij}(x, y) = x^i e_{2+m+j} - y^j e_i$ ,  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2+m} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ .

In the following, we fix an integer  $q \geq 2$ .

- For  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ , let

$$\mathfrak{M}_p = \{(q_1, q_2, \dots, q_p) : q_1, q_2, \dots, q_p \text{ are integers } \geq 1, \text{ with } \sum_{j=1}^p q_j = q\}.$$

- For  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$  and  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathfrak{M}_p$ , let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{p,\mathbf{q}} = \{(e^A)_\# \mathbf{C} : \mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{p,\mathbf{q}}, A \in \mathcal{S}\}$$

and let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \cup_{p=2}^q \cup_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathfrak{M}_p} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}.$$

- For  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$  and  $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_p) \in \mathfrak{M}_p$ , let  $\mathfrak{L}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$  be the space of functions  $\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_p)$  such that for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ ,  $\psi_j : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_j}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  is a (linear) function of the form

$$\psi_j(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j} [\psi_{j,\ell}(x)] \quad \forall (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2},$$

where for  $\ell = 1, \dots, q_j$ ,  $\psi_{j,\ell} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  are linear functions such that for  $k \neq \ell$ , either  $\psi_{j,k}(x) \equiv \psi_{j,\ell}(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$  or  $\psi_{j,k}(x) \neq \psi_{j,\ell}(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ .

- Let  $\mathfrak{L} = \cup_{p=2}^q \cup_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathfrak{M}_p} \mathfrak{L}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ .
- For  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$  and  $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_p) \in \mathfrak{M}_p$ , let  $\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$  be the space of functions  $\tilde{\psi} = (\tilde{\psi}_1, \tilde{\psi}_2, \dots, \tilde{\psi}_p)$  such that:
  - (a)  $\tilde{\psi}_j : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_j}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ ;
  - (b) there are  $\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_p) \in \mathfrak{L}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ , two (single-valued) linear functions  $L_1 : \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $L_2 : \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ , and constant  $m \times 2$  matrices  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_p$  such that for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ ,  $\tilde{\psi}_j(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j} [\psi_{j,\ell}(x) + L_1(y) + A_j L_2(y)]$   $\forall (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ .
- For  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_p) \in \mathfrak{M}_p$  and  $m \times 2$  matrices  $\bar{A}_1, \dots, \bar{A}_p$ , let

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(\bar{A}_1, \dots, \bar{A}_p) = \{\tilde{\psi} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}} : \text{(b) above holds with } A_j = \bar{A}_j \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, p\}.$$

- Let  $\tilde{\mathfrak{L}} = \cup_{p=2}^q \cup_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathfrak{M}_p} \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ .

In the following lemma and subsequently, we let  $r(X) = |(x_1, x_2)|$  for  $X = (x_1, x_2, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  where  $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . The lemma establishes the elementary fact that corresponding to each  $\psi \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ , each sequence of cones  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$  converging to  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n$  and each sequence of numbers  $E_k \rightarrow 0^+$ , there is a sequence of cones  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{p',\mathbf{q}'}$  (for some  $p' \in \{p, \dots, q\}$  and  $\mathbf{q}' \in \mathfrak{M}_{p'}$ ) such that  $\psi$  is the blow-up of  $(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k)$  relative to  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$ .

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathfrak{M}_p$  and let  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{C}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$  with*

$$\epsilon_k^2 = \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n) d\|\mathbf{C}_k\|(X) \rightarrow 0.$$

Write  $\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{j=1}^p q_j [P_j^{(k)}]$  and  $P_j^{(k)} = \{(A_j^{(k)} x, x, y) : (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}\}$  where  $A_j^{(k)}$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$ ) are distinct constant  $m \times 2$  matrices, and suppose that for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ ,  $\epsilon_k^{-1} A_j^{(k)} \rightarrow A_j$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  for some  $m \times 2$  matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_p$ . Let  $\tilde{\psi} = (\tilde{\psi}_j)_{j=1}^p \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(A_1, \dots, A_p)$  and let  $\psi = (\psi_j)_{j=1}^p \in \mathfrak{L}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ ,  $L_1 : \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $L_2 : \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  correspond to  $\tilde{\psi}$  in accordance with the definition of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(A_1, \dots, A_p)$  above. Let  $(E_k)$  be a sequence of positive numbers with  $E_k \leq \beta_k \epsilon_k$  where  $\beta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ . For some  $p' \in \{p, \dots, q\}$ , some  $\mathbf{q}' \in \mathfrak{M}_{p'}$  and each  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , there is a cone  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{p',\mathbf{q}'}$  with  $\int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k\|(X) \leq (\epsilon_k + C E_k)^2$  for sufficiently large  $k$ , where  $C = C(n, q, \tilde{\psi})$  such that:



(i)  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k = \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^{q_j} \llbracket \tilde{P}_{j,l}^{(k)} \rrbracket$  where

$$(4.19) \quad \tilde{P}_{j,l}^{(k)} = \{(A_j^{(k)} x + E_k \tilde{\psi}_{j,l}(x) + \mathcal{R}_{j,l}^{(k)}(x, y), x, y) : (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$$

with

$$(4.20) \quad |\mathcal{R}_{j,l}^{(k)}(x, y)| \leq C(\epsilon_k + \beta_k + |\epsilon_k^{-1} A_j^{(k)} - A_j|) E_k \|L_2\| + C E_k^2 \|L_1\| (|\psi_{j,l}| + \|L_1\| + \|L_2\|)$$

for  $(x, y) \in B_1(0)$ , where  $C = C(n, q)$ .

(ii) For  $\tau \in (0, 1/4)$  and  $k$  sufficiently large,

$$(4.21) \quad \int_{(B_{1/2}(0) \times \mathbb{R}^m) \cap \{r < \tau\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k\| \leq C \|\psi\|_{L^2(B_1(0))}^2 \tau^2 E_k^2$$

where  $C = C(n, q)$ ;

(iii)

$$(4.22) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |\tilde{\psi}_j(X)|^2 dX = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_k^2} \int_{B_{1/2}(0) \times \mathbb{R}^m} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k\|.$$

*Proof.* Note that  $\epsilon_k > 0$  since  $p \geq 2$  and  $A_1^{(k)}, \dots, A_p^{(k)}$  are distinct. Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k = \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^{q_j} \llbracket \tilde{P}_{j,l}^{(k)} \rrbracket$  where

$$\tilde{P}_{j,l}^{(k)} = \{e^{E_k M_1 + E_k M_2 / \epsilon_k} (A_j^{(k)} x + E_k \psi_{j,l}(x), x, y) : (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$$

and

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & L_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -L_1^T & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -L_2 \\ 0 & L_2^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

representing  $L_1$  as an  $m \times (n-2)$  matrix and  $L_2$  as a  $2 \times (n-2)$  matrix. It is clear that  $\tilde{P}_{j,l}^{(k)}$  is close to  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n$  and hence is a graph over  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ .  $e^{E_k M_2 / \epsilon_k}$  is a rotation of the  $(x, y)$ -coordinates. Since  $E_k \leq \beta_k \epsilon_k$ , we have that

$$\tilde{P}_{j,l}^{(k)} = \left\{ e^{E_k M_1} \left( (A_j^{(k)} x + E_k \psi_{j,l}(x) + \epsilon_k^{-1} E_k A_j^{(k)} L_2(y), x, y) + O(\beta_k E_k \|L_2\| |(x, y)|) \right) : (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\}.$$

$e^{E_k M_1}$  is a rotation of the  $(y, z)$ -coordinates. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_{j,l}^{(k)} &= \{(A_j^{(k)} x + E_k \psi_{j,l}(x) + E_k L_1(y) + \epsilon_k^{-1} E_k A_j^{(k)} L_2(y), x, y - E_k L_1^T A_j^{(k)} x) \\ &\quad + O(\beta_k E_k \|L_2\| + E_k^2 \|L_1\| (|\psi_{j,l}| + \|L_1\| + \|L_2\|)) |(x, y)|) : (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n\} \\ &= \{(A_j^{(k)} x + E_k \psi_{j,l}(x) + E_k L_1(y) + \epsilon_k^{-1} E_k A_j^{(k)} L_2(y), x, y) \\ &\quad + O(\beta_k E_k \|L_2\| + E_k^2 \|L_1\| (|\psi_{j,l}| + \|L_1\| + \|L_2\|)) |(x, y)|) : (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n\} \\ &= \{(A_j^{(k)} x + E_k \tilde{\psi}_{j,l}(x) + \mathcal{R}_{j,l}^{(k)}(x, y), x, y) : (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n\} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$|\mathcal{R}_{j,l}^{(k)}(x, y)| \leq C(\beta_k + |\epsilon_k^{-1} A_j^{(k)} - A_j|) E_k \|L_2\| + C E_k^2 \|L_1\| (|\psi_{j,l}| + \|L_1\| + \|L_2\|)$$

with  $C = C(n, q)$ . The rest of the conclusions are now immediate.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6.** Let  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathfrak{M}_p$ ,  $M \geq 1$ ,  $w = (w_j)_{j=1}^p \in \mathfrak{B}_{p, \mathbf{q}}(M, A_1, \dots, A_p)$  with associated sequences of locally area minimizing rectifiable currents  $T_k$  in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$ , cones  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$  and  $m \times 2$  matrices  $A_j^{(k)}$  ( $1 \leq j \leq p$ ) corresponding to  $\mathbf{C}_k$  (as in condition (A) above) such that  $\hat{E}_k^{-1} A_j^{(k)} \rightarrow A_j$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , where  $\hat{E}_k = E(T_k, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ . Let

$E_k = E(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$  and let  $\tilde{\psi} = (\tilde{\psi}_j)_{j=1}^p \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(A_1, \dots, A_p)$ . For each  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , let  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k$  be the cone corresponding to  $\mathbf{C}_k, \tilde{\psi}, E_k$  given by Lemma 4.5. Then for every  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$(4.23) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k^{-2} E(T_k, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k, \mathbf{B}_\rho(0))^2 \leq \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \tilde{\psi}_j)^2;$$

$$(4.24) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k^{-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0) \setminus \{r \leq \rho/8\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T_k) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k\| \leq \int_{B_\rho(0) \setminus \{r \leq \rho/8\}} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \tilde{\psi}_j)^2.$$

*Proof.* By (4.6), for every  $\delta \in (0, 1/4)$ ,  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  and  $k$  sufficiently large we have that

$$\int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0) \cap \{r < \delta\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|T_k\| \leq C\delta^{1/2} E_k^2,$$

and consequently, by the triangle inequality,

$$\int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0) \cap \{r < \delta\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k) d\|T_k\| \leq C\delta^{1/2} E_k^2,$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \rho) \in (0, \infty)$ . In view of this, the conclusions (4.23) and (4.24) follow from the definition of fine blow-up, (4.19) and the estimates (4.20) and (4.21).  $\square$

**4.2. Main estimates for fine blow-ups.** We shall now derive estimates for  $w \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$  that correspond to the estimates in Section 3. These estimates will form the basis of our asymptotic analysis of the fine blow-ups (carried out in Sections 4.3 and 4.4 below) which in turn will play a key role in the proof of the main excess decay result, Lemma 4.13.

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathfrak{M}_p$ ,  $M \geq 1$  and  $w = (w_i)_{i=1}^p \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(M, A_1, \dots, A_p)$  for some  $m \times 2$  matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_p$ . The following estimates hold:*

(a) for each  $\psi = (\psi_i)_{i=1}^p \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(A_1, \dots, A_p)$  and each  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ ,

$$(4.25) \quad \int_{B_{\rho/2}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p R^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial(w_i/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 \leq C\rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i, \psi_i)^2,$$

where  $R = |X|$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant;

(b) for each  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ ,

$$(4.26) \quad \rho^{-n} \int_{B_{\rho/2}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p |D_y w_i|^2 \leq C\rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p |w_i|^2,$$

where  $X = (x, y)$  for  $x = (x_1, x_2)$  and  $y = (x_3, \dots, x_n)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant;

(c) there exist functions  $\lambda_1 : B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\lambda_2 : B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  with

$$(4.27) \quad \sup_{B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0)} (|\lambda_1(z)| + |\lambda_2(z)|) \leq C$$

such that for each  $\sigma \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  and  $z \in B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0)$ ,

$$(4.28) \quad \int_{B_{\rho/2}(0,z)} \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{|w_i(X) - (\lambda_1(z) - A_i \lambda_2(z))|^2}{|X - (0, z)|^{n+2-\sigma}} dX \leq C\rho^{-n-2+\sigma} \int_{B_\rho(0,z)} \sum_{i=1}^p |w_i - (\lambda_1(z) - A_i \lambda_2(z))|^2$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, M, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Moreover,  $\lambda_1(z), \lambda_2(z)$  are uniquely determined (by  $z, w$  and  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_p$ ) subject only to the condition

$$\int_{B_\rho(0,z)} \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{|w_i(X) - (\lambda_1(z) - A_i \lambda_2(z))|^2}{|X - (0, z)|^{n+2-\sigma}} dX < \infty \quad \text{for some } \sigma \in (0, 1/2) \text{ and some } \rho \in (|z|, 1/2).$$

*Proof.* Let  $w = (w_i)_{i=1}^p \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(M, A_1, \dots, A_p)$ . Choose a sequence  $(T_k)$  of locally area minimizing rectifiable currents in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  and a sequence  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$  of cones in  $\mathcal{C}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$  such that the  $m \times 2$  matrices  $A_i^{(k)}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq p$ ) corresponding to  $\mathbf{C}_k$  (as in condition (A) above) satisfy  $\hat{E}_k^{-1} A_i^{(k)} \rightarrow A_i$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , and such that  $w$  is the fine blow-up of  $(T_k)$  relative to  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$  in accordance with Definition 4.1.

To see part (a), let  $\psi = (\psi_i)_{i=1}^p \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(A_1, \dots, A_p)$ . For each  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , let  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{p',\mathbf{q}'}$  be the cone given by Lemma 4.5 corresponding to  $\mathbf{C}_k$ ,  $\psi$  and  $E_k = E(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ , and let  $R_k \in \mathcal{S}$  be such that  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_k \equiv (e^{-R_k})_{\#} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{p',\mathbf{q}'}$ . Let  $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(n, m, q, 1/2)$ ,  $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n, m, q, 1/2)$  be as in Theorem 3.9 taken with  $\gamma = 1/2$ . Fix  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ . Note that for sufficiently large  $k$ , Hypothesis  $(\star)$  is satisfied with  $\eta_{0,\rho} \# T_k$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k$  in place of  $T, \mathbf{C}$  (since  $E(T_k, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \rightarrow 0$  and hence, by condition (4) of Section 4.1,  $Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \rightarrow 0$ ), and hence Hypothesis  $(\star)$  also holds with  $\hat{T}_k \equiv \eta_{0,\rho} \# (e^{-R_k})_{\#} T_k$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_k$  in place of  $T, \mathbf{C}$ . Suppose that for sufficiently large  $k$ , Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$  is satisfied with  $\hat{T}_k, \hat{\mathbf{C}}_k$  in place of  $T, \mathbf{C}$ , i.e. that

$$(4.29) \quad Q(\hat{T}_k, \hat{\mathbf{C}}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq \beta_0 \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{p'=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}}$$

for sufficiently large  $k$ . Then we can apply Theorem 3.9(a) (with  $\hat{T}_k, \hat{\mathbf{C}}_k$  in place of  $T, \mathbf{C}$ ) to deduce that

$$\int_{\mathbf{B}_{\rho/2}(0)} \frac{|X^\perp|^2}{|X|^{n+2}} d\|T_k\|(X) \leq C\rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k) d\|T_k\|(X)$$

for all sufficiently large  $k$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Reasoning exactly as in the proof of Corollary 3.12, this implies, for any  $\tau \in (0, \rho/4)$  and all sufficiently large  $k$ ,

$$\int_{B_{\rho/2}(0) \setminus \{r < \tau\}} \sum_{i=1}^p R^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial(u_i^{(k)}/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 \leq C\rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k) d\|T_k\|(X)$$

where  $u_i^{(k)}$  are as in (4.8). Dividing this by  $E_k$ , letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and applying Lemma 4.6, and then letting  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ , this yields (4.25). If on the other hand (4.29) fails for infinitely many  $k$ , then (see Remark 3.8) we can choose  $p' \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$ , a subsequence of  $(k)$  without relabeling, and cones  $\mathbf{C}'_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}$  such that:

- (i)  $Q(\hat{T}_k, \mathbf{C}'_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < (2\beta_0^{-1})^{p-1} Q(\hat{T}_k, \hat{\mathbf{C}}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$  and
- (ii) either  $p' = 1$  or Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$  holds with  $\hat{T}_k, \mathbf{C}'_k$  in place of  $T, \mathbf{C}$ .

We clearly also have that Hypothesis  $(\star)$  is satisfied with  $\hat{T}_k, \mathbf{C}'_k$  in place of  $T, \mathbf{C}$  (by (i), and the fact that  $Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \rightarrow 0$  whence  $Q(\hat{T}_k, \hat{\mathbf{C}}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \rightarrow 0$ ). We can thus apply Theorem 3.9(a) again, with  $\hat{T}_k, \mathbf{C}'_k$  in place of  $T, \mathbf{C}$  (noting that if we have in (ii) above that  $p' = 1$ , then Theorem 3.9(a) holds by a standard argument based on the monotonicity formula, Theorem 2.9

and Lemma 2.11), and combine the resulting inequality with (i) above to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\rho/2}(0)} \frac{|X^\perp|^2}{|X|^{n+2}} d\|T_k\|(X) &\leq C\rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k) d\|T_k\|(X) \\ &\quad + C\rho^{-n-2} \int_{e^{-R_k}(\mathbf{B}_{\rho/2}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < \rho/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T_k) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

for infinitely many  $k$ . Again reasoning as in the proof of Corollary 3.12, this implies, for any  $\tau \in (0, \rho/4)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\rho/2}(0) \setminus \{r < \tau\}} R^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial(u_i^{(k)}/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 &\leq C\rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k) d\|T_k\|(X) \\ &\quad + C\rho^{-n-2} \int_{e^{-R_k}(\mathbf{B}_{\rho/2}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < \rho/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T_k) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

for infinitely many  $k$ . Dividing this by  $E_k$ , letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and then letting  $\tau \rightarrow 0$ , in view of Lemma 4.6 and the fact that  $e^{-R_k} \rightarrow I$ , this yields (4.25).

Part (b) follows directly from (4.10) and (4.17).

To see Part (c), let  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  and  $z \in B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0)$ . By (4.1), for each  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  there exists  $Z_k(z) = (\chi_k(z), \xi_k(z), \zeta_k(z)) \in \mathbf{B}_{\delta_k}(0, z)$  with  $\Theta(\|T_k\|, Z_k(z)) \geq q$ . By (4.11),

$$(4.30) \quad \int_{B_{\rho/2}(\xi_k(z), \zeta_k(z)) \cap \{r > \tau_k\}} \frac{|u_i^{(k)}(x, y) - (\chi_k(z) - A_i^{(k)}\xi_k(z))|^2}{|(u_i^{(k)}(x, y) - \chi_k(z), x - \xi_k(z), y - \zeta_k(z))|^{n+2-\sigma}} \leq C_1\rho^{-n-2+\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m \times B_\rho(\xi_k(z), \zeta_k(z))} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \nu_{Z_k(z)} \# \mathbf{C}_k) d\|T_k\|$$

for all sufficiently large  $k$ , where  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q, M, 1/2, \sigma)$ . By (4.9), there are  $\lambda_1(z) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $\lambda_2(z) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  with  $|\lambda_1(z)|, |\lambda_2(z)| \leq C = C(n, m, q, M)$  such that, passing to a further subsequence,  $E_k^{-1}\chi_k(z) \rightarrow \lambda_1(z)$  and  $E_k^{-1}\widehat{E}_k\xi_k(z) \rightarrow \lambda_2(z)$ . Hence dividing the above by  $E_k$  and letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain the existence of  $\lambda_1(z), \lambda_2(z)$  such that (4.28) holds with  $C = C_1$ . Moreover  $\lambda_1(z), \lambda_2(z)$  are uniquely determined by  $z, w$  and  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_p$  (independently of  $\rho, \sigma$  and the chosen sequence  $(Z_k(z))$ ); to see this, let  $z \in B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0)$ ,  $|z| < \rho_1, \rho_2 < 1/2$  and suppose that for  $\ell = 1, 2$ , there are  $\lambda_1^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^m, \lambda_2^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^2$  such that

$$\int_{B_{\rho_\ell/2}(0, z)} \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{|w_i(X) - (\lambda_1^{(\ell)} - A_i\lambda_2^{(\ell)})|^2}{|X - (0, z)|^{n+2-\sigma_\ell}} dX < \infty$$

for some  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$  with  $0 < \sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 < 1/2$ . By replacing  $\rho_1, \rho_2$  with  $\min\{\rho_1, \rho_2\}$ , we may assume  $\rho_1 = \rho_2$ . By the triangle inequality this implies that

$$\int_{B_{\rho_1/2}(0, z)} \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{|(\lambda_1^{(1)} - \lambda_1^{(2)}) - A_i(\lambda_2^{(1)} - \lambda_2^{(2)})|^2}{|X - (0, z)|^{n+2-\sigma_2}} dX < \infty$$

whence (since  $\int_{B_{\rho_1/2}(0, z)} |X - (0, z)|^{-n-2+\sigma_2} dX = \infty$ ) we must have  $(\lambda_1^{(1)} - \lambda_1^{(2)}) - A_i(\lambda_2^{(1)} - \lambda_2^{(2)}) = 0$  for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ . By (4.14) (which holds automatically, see Remark 4.3) this gives first that  $\lambda_2^{(1)} = \lambda_2^{(2)}$  and consequently also that  $\lambda_1^{(1)} = \lambda_1^{(2)}$ .  $\square$

**4.3. Classification of homogeneous degree 1 fine blow-ups.** In this section we establish the following classification theorem for homogeneous degree 1 fine blow-ups:

**Theorem 4.8.** *Let  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_p) \in \mathfrak{M}_p$  and  $M \geq 1$ . Let  $w = (w_j)_{j=1}^p \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(M)$  be homogeneous of degree 1 in the sense that  $X \mapsto w_j(X)$  is an  $\mathcal{A}_{q_j}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ -valued homogeneous degree 1 function of  $X \in B_1(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ . Then  $w \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ , and moreover there are a function  $\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_p) \in \mathfrak{L}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ , constant  $(m \times 2)$  matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_p$ , and two linear functions  $L_1 : \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $L_2 : \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  with*

$$(4.31) \quad \|A_j\| + \|L_1\| + \|L_2\| \leq C, \quad \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \inf_{x \in \mathbb{S}^1} |A_i x - A_j x| \geq c/M$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q)$ ,  $c = c(n, m, q)$ , such that  $w_j(x, y) = \sum_{k=1}^{q_j} [\psi_{j,k}(x) + L_1(y) + A_j L_2(y)]$  for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  and  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $w$  satisfies (4.28) for some functions  $\lambda_1 : B_{1/4}(0) \cap \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\lambda_2 : B_{1/4}(0) \cap \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  and some constant  $(m \times 2)$  matrices  $A_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq p$ . First consider the case  $\lambda_1 = 0$ ,  $\lambda_2 = 0$ , i.e. the case where for each  $\sigma \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  and  $z \in B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0)$ ,

$$(4.32) \quad \int_{B_{\rho/2}((0,z))} \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{|w_j(X)|^2}{|X - (0, z)|^{n+2-\sigma}} dX \leq C \rho^{-n-2+\sigma} \int_{B_{\rho}((0,z))} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, M, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$ . Since each  $w_j$  is locally Dirichlet energy minimizing in  $B_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , it follows from standard sup and energy estimates for such functions ([Alm83]) and (4.32) that for every  $\sigma \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  and every  $X = (x, y) \in B_{\rho/2}^2(0) \times B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ ,

$$(4.33) \quad \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j(X)|^2 + |x|^{2-n} \int_{B_{|x|/2}(X)} \sum_{j=1}^p |Dw_j|^2 \leq C \left( \frac{|x|}{\rho} \right)^{2-\sigma} \rho^{-n} \int_{B_{\rho}(0,y)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$ . From this, with the help of a standard covering argument, it follows that for each  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $\delta \in (0, 1/16)$  and  $z \in B_{1/16}^{n-2}(0)$ ,

$$(4.34) \quad \rho^{2-n} \int_{B_{\rho/16}(0,z) \cap \{\delta\rho/2 \leq r \leq \delta\rho\}} \sum_{j=1}^p |Dw_j|^2 < C \delta^{2-\sigma} \rho^{-n} \int_{B_{\rho}(0,z)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \sigma)$ , whence for each  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $\delta \in (0, 1/16)$  and  $z \in B_{1/16}^{n-2}(0)$ ,

$$(4.35) \quad \rho^{2-n} \int_{B_{\rho/16}(0,z) \cap \{r \leq \delta\rho\}} \sum_{j=1}^p |Dw_j|^2 < C \delta^{2-\sigma} \rho^{-n} \int_{B_{\rho}(0,z)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2;$$

in particular, for each  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  and  $z \in B_{1/16}^{n-2}(0)$ ,

$$(4.36) \quad \rho^{2-n} \int_{B_{\rho/16}(0,z)} \sum_{j=1}^p |Dw_j|^2 < C \rho^{-n} \int_{B_{\rho}(0,z)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q)$ .

Now fix  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , and set  $\bar{w} = w_j$  and  $\bar{q} = q_j$ . Since  $\bar{w}$  is  $\mathcal{A}_{\bar{q}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ -valued, we may write

$$\bar{w}(X) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\bar{q}} [\bar{w}_{\ell}(X)],$$

where  $\bar{w}_\ell(X) = (\bar{w}_\ell^1(X), \bar{w}_\ell^2(X), \dots, \bar{w}_\ell^m(X)) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . With this notation, we next verify the two identities:

$$(4.37) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |D\bar{w}|^2 \zeta = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \bar{w}_\ell^k D_i \bar{w}_\ell^k D_i \zeta,$$

$$(4.38) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( \frac{1}{2} |D\bar{w}|^2 \delta_{ik} - D_i \bar{w}_\ell^k D_k \bar{w}_\ell^k \right) D_i \zeta_k = 0,$$

for all  $\zeta, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n \in C_c^1(B_{1/16}(0))$ , where we use the convention of summing over repeated indices. Indeed, since  $\bar{w}$  is locally energy minimizing in  $B_{1/16}(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , (4.37), (4.38) hold whenever  $\zeta, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n \in C_c^1(B_{1/16}(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})$ . For  $\delta \in (0, 1/32)$ , let  $\tilde{\chi}_\delta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth function such that  $0 \leq \tilde{\chi}_\delta(r) \leq 1$ ,  $\tilde{\chi}_\delta(r) = 0$  for all  $r \in [0, \delta/2]$ ,  $\tilde{\chi}_\delta(r) = 1$  for all  $r \geq \delta$ , and  $|\tilde{\chi}_\delta'(r)| \leq 3/\delta$ . Define  $\chi_\delta : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\chi_\delta(x, y) = \tilde{\chi}_\delta(|x|)$ . Let  $\zeta \in C_c^1(B_{1/16}(0))$  be arbitrary and replace  $\zeta$  in (4.37) by  $\chi_\delta \zeta$  to get, using (4.33), (4.34) and (4.18), that

$$(4.39) \quad \left| \int_{B_{1/16}(0)} (|D\bar{w}|^2 \zeta + \bar{w}_\ell^k D_i \bar{w}_\ell^k D_i \zeta) \chi_\delta \right| \leq \int_{B_{1/16}(0)} |\bar{w}| |D\bar{w}| |D\chi_\delta| |\zeta| \\ \leq C \delta^{2-\sigma} \sup_{B_{1/16}(0)} |\zeta|$$

for every  $\sigma \in (0, 1/2)$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$ . In view of (4.36) and (4.33), we may let  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$  in this to conclude (4.37). A similar argument (using both (4.34) and (4.36)) yields (4.38).

It is standard (see e.g. [KrumWic17, Section 4.4]) that (4.37), (4.38) imply that either  $\bar{w} \equiv \bar{q}[0]$  in  $B_{1/16}(0)$  or for each  $Z \in B_{1/16}(0)$  and  $\rho \in (0, 1/16)$ , the frequency function

$$(4.40) \quad N_{\bar{w}, Z}(\rho) = \frac{\rho^{2-n} \int_{B_\rho(Z)} |D\bar{w}|^2}{\rho^{1-n} \int_{\partial B_\rho(Z)} |\bar{w}|^2}$$

is well-defined and monotone nondecreasing as a function of  $\rho \in (0, 1/16)$ . Suppose that  $\bar{w}$  is not identically zero, and write  $\mathcal{N}_{\bar{w}}(Z) = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0^+} N_{\bar{w}, Z}(\rho)$ . Since  $\bar{w}$  is homogeneous of degree 1 from the origin,  $1 = \mathcal{N}_{\bar{w}}(0) \geq \mathcal{N}_{\bar{w}}(Z)$  for each  $Z \in B_{1/16}(0)$ .

Let  $Z = (0, z) \in B_{1/16}(0) \cap \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . By (4.32) we have that for each  $\sigma \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $\sup_{\rho \in (0, 1/4)} \rho^{-n-2+\sigma} \int_{B_\rho(Z)} |\bar{w}|^2 < \infty$ , while by the monotonicity of the frequency function (4.40) we have that  $\inf_{\rho \in (0, \rho_1)} \rho^{-n-2N_{\bar{w}, Z}(\rho_1)} \int_{B_\rho(Z)} |\bar{w}|^2 > 0$  for each  $\rho_1 \in (0, 1/16)$ . It follows that  $2N_{\bar{w}, Z}(\rho_1) \geq 2 - \sigma$  for each  $\rho_1 \in (0, 1/16)$  and  $\sigma \in (0, 1/2)$ , whence, letting  $\sigma, \rho_1 \rightarrow 0$ , we deduce that  $\mathcal{N}_{\bar{w}}(Z) \geq 1$ . Thus  $\mathcal{N}_{\bar{w}}(Z) = \mathcal{N}_{\bar{w}}(0) = 1$  for every  $Z \in \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , and hence by standard arguments again,  $\bar{w}$  is invariant under translations along the subspace  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Thus there is a function  $\bar{w}_1 \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathcal{A}_{\bar{q}}(\mathbb{R}^m))$  such that  $\bar{w}(x, y) = \bar{w}_1(x)$  for all  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Since  $\bar{w}_1$  is homogeneous of degree 1 and locally energy minimizing in  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\bar{w}_1$  is given by  $\bar{q}$  linear functions on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , of which any two distinct functions take distinct values at every point  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ . We have thus shown that a homogeneous degree 1 element  $w \in \mathfrak{B}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$  belongs to  $\mathfrak{L}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$  subject to the additional assumption that the two functions  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$  corresponding to  $w$  as in (4.28) are both zero.

To complete the proof of the theorem, let now  $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_p)$  be an arbitrary homogeneous degree 1 element of  $\mathfrak{B}_{p, \mathbf{q}}(M)$ . Then  $w \in \mathfrak{B}_{p, \mathbf{q}}(M, A_1, \dots, A_p)$  for some  $m \times 2$  matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_p$  satisfying (4.13) and (4.14). By Lemma 4.7(c), there are functions  $\lambda_1 : B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\lambda_2 : B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  satisfying (4.27) and (4.28). Fix  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  and write  $w_j(X) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j} [w_{j, \ell}(X)]$  with  $w_{j, \ell}(X) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Let  $w_{j, a}$  denote the single-valued average given by  $w_{j, a}(X) = q_j^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j} w_{j, \ell}(X)$  for  $X \in B_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Since  $w_j$  is locally Dirichlet energy minimizing on  $B_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ ,

we have that  $w_{j,a}$  is harmonic on  $B_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . By (4.28) (with  $\rho = 1/4$  and  $\sigma = 1/4$ ), (4.18), (4.27) and (4.13), we have that for each  $z \in B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0)$ ,

$$(4.41) \quad \int_{B_{1/4}(0,z)} \frac{|w_{j,a}(X) - (\lambda_1(z) - A_j \lambda_2(z))|^2}{|X - (0, z)|^{n+2-1/4}} dX \leq C$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, M) \in (0, \infty)$ . Since  $|\lambda_1(z) - A_j \lambda_2(z)| \leq C$ , this implies that

$$\rho^{-n} \int_{B_\rho(0,z)} |w_{j,a}|^2 \leq C$$

for any  $z \in B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0)$  and any  $\rho \in (0, 1/4)$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q, M)$ . Consequently, by the mean value property for harmonic functions, we have that  $w_{j,a}$  is bounded on  $B_{1/4}(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . It is then standard to see that  $w_{j,a}$  extends to  $B_{1/4}(0)$  as a harmonic function (e.g. by using the fact that  $\int_{B_{1/4}(0)} |Dw_{j,a}|^2 \zeta^2 \leq 4 \int_{B_{1/4}(0)} |w_{j,a}|^2 |D\zeta|^2$  for all  $\zeta \in C_c^1(B_{1/4}(0) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}))$ ) and the fact that  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  has vanishing 2-capacity to verify first that  $w_{j,a} \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_{1/4}(0))$ , followed by another use of the same vanishing 2-capacity property to verify that  $w_{j,a}$  is weakly harmonic in  $B_{1/4}(0)$ ). Since  $w_j$  is homogeneous of degree 1 on  $B_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  by assumption, this extended function (which we shall continue to denote by  $w_{j,a}$ ) is homogeneous of degree 1, so it is a linear function on  $B_{1/4}(0)$ . Since (4.41) implies that  $w_{j,a}|_{\{0\} \times B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0)} = \lambda_1 - A_j \lambda_2$ , we conclude that for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , the function  $\lambda^{(j)} = \lambda_1 - A_j \lambda_2 : B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is linear. Since by (4.14) there are  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  such that  $A_i - A_j$  has full rank ( $= 2$ ), it follows that  $\lambda_2$  is linear and consequently so is  $\lambda_1$ . Thus, writing points  $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  as column vectors, there is a constant  $m \times (n-2)$  matrix  $D_1$  and a constant  $2 \times (n-2)$  matrix  $D_2$  such that  $\lambda_1(z) = D_1 z$  and  $\lambda_2(z) = D_2 z$ . Now, there is  $(T_k)$  a sequence of locally area minimizing rectifiable currents in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with  $\partial T_k \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0$ , and  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$  a sequence of cones in  $\mathcal{C}_{p,q}$  such that  $w$  is the fine blow-up of  $(T_k)$  relative to  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$ . Let  $E_k = E(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ . Define rotations  $R_k^{(1)}, R_k^{(2)} : \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$  by  $R_k^{(1)} = e^{E_k M_1}$  and  $R_k^{(2)} = e^{\widehat{E}_k^{-1} E_k M_2}$  where  $M_1, M_2$  are as in the proof of Lemma 4.5 with  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$  in place of  $L_1, L_2$  respectively and  $\widehat{E}_k = E(T_k, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ . By the argument of [KrumWic17, Theorem 10.1] (see the end of [KrumWic17, Section 10.2]) and Lemma 4.5, we see that the fine blow-up  $\tilde{w} = (\tilde{w}_1, \tilde{w}_2, \dots, \tilde{w}_p) \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,q}$  of the rotated sequence  $\tilde{T}_k = R_k^{(1)} \# R_k^{(2)} \# T_k$  relative to the (same) sequence of cones  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$  (by the excess  $\tilde{E}_k = E(\tilde{T}_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ ) satisfies

$$(4.42) \quad \tilde{c} \tilde{w}_j(x, y) = w_j(x, y) - (\lambda_1(y) - A_j \lambda_2(y))$$

for some constant  $\tilde{c} \in [0, C]$  (with  $C = C(n, m, q)$ ) and all  $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$ ; in fact

$$\tilde{c} = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k^{-1} \tilde{E}_k.$$

If  $\tilde{c} = 0$  then  $w_j(x, y) = q_j [\lambda_1(y) - A_j \lambda_2(y)]$  for each  $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$ , so in this case  $w \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,q}$  trivially. If on the other hand  $\tilde{c} > 0$ , then by (4.28) and (4.42), we see that  $\tilde{w}$  is a homogeneous degree 1 element of  $\mathfrak{B}_{p,q}$  satisfying, for each  $\sigma \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$  and  $z \in B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0)$ ,

$$\int_{B_{\rho/2}(0,z)} \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{|\tilde{w}_j(X)|^2}{|X - (0, z)|^{n+2-\sigma}} dX \leq C \rho^{-n-2+\sigma} \int_{B_\rho(0,z)} \sum_{j=1}^p |\tilde{w}_j|^2$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, M, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$ . So by applying the special case (i.e. the case  $\lambda_1 = 0, \lambda_2 = 0$ ) of the theorem just proved to  $\tilde{w}$ , we see that  $\tilde{w} \in \mathfrak{L}_{p,q}$ . By (4.42), this means that  $w \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,q}$ , i.e.  $w_j(x, y) = \sum_{k=1}^{q_j} [\psi_{j,k}(x) + L_1(y) + A_j L_2(y)]$  for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  and  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  where  $L_i = \lambda_1$  and  $L_2 = \lambda_2$ . The asserted bounds (4.31) follow from (4.27), (4.13) and (4.14).  $\square$

**4.4. Asymptotic decay of fine blow-ups.** The main result of this section is a decay estimate for the fine blow-ups, Theorem 4.11. Broadly speaking, our proof of Theorem 4.11 will employ the well-known hole-filling technique, in a manner similar to its use in [Sim93] for the multiplicity 1 counterpart of the result, and will be based on the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$  and  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathfrak{M}_p$ . There is a constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  such that if  $w \in \mathfrak{B}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$  and if  $\psi \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$  is such that*

$$(4.43) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j)^2 \leq 2 \inf_{\psi' \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p, \mathbf{q}}} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi'_j)^2$$

then

$$(4.44) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j)^2 \leq C \int_{B_{1/2}(0) \setminus B_{1/8}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \left| \frac{\partial(w_j/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2.$$

Because ours is a higher multiplicity setting and the functions involved are multi-valued, the proof of Lemma 4.9 will have to be different from that of the analogous result in [Sim93]. We proceed in two steps, where the first step is Lemma 4.10 below giving the same conclusions as Lemma 4.9 subject to a weaker condition on  $\psi$  (namely, inequality (4.45)) than (4.43), together with an additional hypothesis on  $w$  (namely, condition (4.46)) that is the analogue, for fine blow-ups, of Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$  on area minimizing currents associated with fine blow-ups. Note also that in Lemma 4.10, we work under the assumption that  $\psi \in \mathfrak{L}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$  (rather than  $\psi \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$ ).

Let  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_p) \in \mathfrak{M}_p$  and  $\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_p) \in \mathfrak{L}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$ . Recall that then  $\sum_{j=1}^p q_j = q$  and for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , we have that  $\psi_j(x, y) = \sum_{k=1}^{q_j} \llbracket \psi_{j,k}(x) \rrbracket$  for all  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \approx \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , where  $\psi_{j,k} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  are linear functions. In Lemma 4.10, we shall use the following additional notation:

For  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , let  $d_j(\psi)$  be the number of *distinct* functions in the collection  $\{\psi_{j,k} : k = 1, \dots, q_j\}$ .

Let  $d(\psi) = \sum_{j=1}^p d_j(\psi)$ . Note that then  $1 \leq d_j(\psi) \leq q_j$  and  $p \leq d(\psi) \leq q$ .

For  $p \leq s \leq q$ , let  $\mathfrak{L}_{p, \mathbf{q}}(s) = \{\psi \in \mathfrak{L}_{p, \mathbf{q}} : d(\psi) = s\}$  and note that  $\mathfrak{L}_{p, \mathbf{q}} = \cup_{s=p}^q \mathfrak{L}_{p, \mathbf{q}}(s)$ .

**Lemma 4.10.** *For every  $\overline{M} \geq 1$  and  $M \geq 1$ , there exist constants  $\overline{\beta} = \overline{\beta}(n, m, q, M, \overline{M}) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\overline{C} = \overline{C}(n, m, q, M, \overline{M}) \in (0, \infty)$  such that the following holds: if  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathfrak{M}_p$ ,  $w \in \mathfrak{B}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$  and  $\psi \in \mathfrak{L}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$  are such that*

$$(4.45) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j)^2 \leq 2\overline{M}^2 \inf_{\psi' \in \mathfrak{L}_{p, \mathbf{q}}} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi'_j)^2,$$

and either (i)  $d(\psi) = p$ , or (ii)  $d(\psi) > p$  and

$$(4.46) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j)^2 \leq \overline{\beta}^2 \inf_{\psi' \in \cup_{s=p}^{d(\psi)-1} \mathfrak{L}_{p, \mathbf{q}}(s)} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi'_j)^2,$$

then (4.44) holds with  $C = \overline{C}$ .

*Proof.* Note that it suffices to fix  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_p) \in \mathfrak{M}_p$ ,  $s \in \{p, \dots, q\}$  and prove the lemma for  $\psi \in \mathfrak{L}_{p, \mathbf{q}}(s)$ , with  $\overline{\beta}$  and  $\overline{C}$  depending on  $n, m, q, M, \overline{M}, p, \mathbf{q}$  and  $s$ . We argue by contradiction, so suppose that for some fixed  $\overline{M} \geq 1$ ,  $M \geq 1$ ,  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathfrak{M}_p$  and



$s \in \{p, \dots, q\}$ , and for each  $\nu = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , there exist  $\bar{\beta}_\nu > 0$ ,  $w^{(\nu)} = (w_1^{(\nu)}, \dots, w_p^{(\nu)}) \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(M)$ ,  $\psi^{(\nu)} = (\psi_1^{(\nu)}, \dots, \psi_p^{(\nu)}) \in \mathfrak{L}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(s)$  such that  $\bar{\beta}_\nu \downarrow 0$  and for each  $\nu$ ,

$$(4.47) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j^{(\nu)}, \psi_j^{(\nu)})^2 \leq 2\bar{M}^2 \inf_{\psi' \in \mathfrak{L}_{p,\mathbf{q}}} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j^{(\nu)}, \psi_j')^2,$$

and either (i)  $d(\psi^{(\nu)}) = p$  (i.e.  $s = p$ ), or (ii)  $d(\psi^{(\nu)}) > p$  (i.e.  $s > p$ ) and

$$(4.48) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j^{(\nu)}, \psi_j^{(\nu)})^2 \leq \bar{\beta}_\nu^2 \inf_{\psi' \in \bigcup_{s=p}^{d(\psi)-1} \mathfrak{L}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(s)} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j^{(\nu)}, \psi_j')^2,$$

and yet

$$(4.49) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}(0) \setminus B_{1/8}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \left| \frac{\partial(w_j^{(\nu)}/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 < \frac{1}{\nu} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j^{(\nu)}, \psi_j^{(\nu)})^2.$$

Write

$$F_\nu = \left( \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j^{(\nu)}, \psi_j^{(\nu)})^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

and note that  $F_\nu > 0$  by (4.49). To obtain a contradiction, we shall proceed in 5 steps.

**Step 1:** *Selection of currents associated with  $w^{(\nu)}$ , construction of cones associated with  $\psi^{(\nu)}$  and some preliminary bounds.* Since  $w^{(\nu)} \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ , there exist a sequence of locally area minimizing rectifiable currents  $(T^{(\nu,k)})_{k=1}^\infty$  in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with  $\partial T^{(\nu,k)} \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0$ , a sequence of cones  $(\mathbf{C}^{(\nu,k)})_{k=1}^\infty$  in  $\mathcal{C}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$  and sequences of positive numbers  $(\epsilon^{(\nu,k)})_{k=1}^\infty$ ,  $(\beta^{(\nu,k)})_{k=1}^\infty$ ,  $(\eta^{(\nu,k)})_{k=1}^\infty$  and  $(\delta^{(\nu,k)})_{k=1}^\infty$  tending to 0, all such that conditions (1)-(8) of Section 4.1 and condition (4.1) hold with  $T_k = T^{(\nu,k)}$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k = \mathbf{C}^{(\nu,k)}$ ,  $p_k = p$ ,  $q_j^{(k)} = q_j$ ,  $\epsilon_k = \epsilon^{(\nu,k)}$ ,  $\beta_k = \beta^{(\nu,k)}$ ,  $\eta_k = \eta^{(\nu,k)}$ ,  $\delta_k = \delta^{(\nu,k)}$ , and such that  $w^{(\nu)}$  is the fine blow-up (as in Definition 4.1) of  $T^{(\nu,k)}$  relative to  $\mathbf{C}^{(\nu,k)}$ ; denote the relevant excess by

$$(4.50) \quad E_{\nu,k} = \left( \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}^{(\nu,k)}\|) d\|T^{(\nu,k)}\| \right)^{1/2}.$$

By the definition of fine blow-up, for each  $\nu$ , there is a sequence of positive numbers  $(\tau^{(\nu,k)})_{k=1}^\infty$  with  $\tau^{(\nu,k)} \rightarrow 0$  and functions  $u_i^{(\nu,k)} : B_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{r < \tau_{\nu,k}\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$  corresponding to the sequences  $(\tau_k)$ ,  $(u_i^{(k)})$  respectively as in the discussion of Section 4.1 taken with  $\gamma = 1/2$ ,  $T = T^{(\nu,k)}$ , and  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}^{(\nu,k)}$ ; and moreover, for each  $\nu = 1, 2, \dots$  and each  $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$ , we have (by (4.16)) that

$$(4.51) \quad \frac{u_i^{(\nu,k)}}{E_{\nu,k}} \rightarrow w_i^{(\nu)}$$

in  $L^2(B_{1/2}; \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m))$  and also that  $|Du_i^{(\nu,k)}|/E_{\nu,k} \rightarrow |Dw_i^{(\nu)}|$  locally in  $L^2(K)$  for each compact set  $K \subset B_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . By the definition of  $\mathfrak{L}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(s)$ , we have that  $d(\psi^{(\nu)}) = s$  and  $\psi_i^{(\nu)}(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_i} \psi_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and for all  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \approx \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , where  $\psi_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is a linear function such that for  $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$ , either  $\psi_{i,\ell_1}(x) \equiv \psi_{i,\ell_2}(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$  or  $\psi_{i,\ell_1}(x) \neq \psi_{i,\ell_2}(x)$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ . By the definition of  $\mathcal{C}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ , we have that

$$(4.52) \quad \mathbf{C}^{(\nu,k)} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i^{(\nu,k)} \rrbracket$$

where for each  $\nu$  and each  $k$ ,  $P_i^{(\nu,k)}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq p$ ) are distinct  $n$ -dimensional oriented planes with  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} = P_i^{(\nu,k)} \cap P_j^{(\nu,k)}$  whenever  $i \neq j$ , and with orienting  $n$ -vector  $\vec{P}_i^{(\nu,k)}$ , and moreover,  $P_i^{(\nu,k)} = \{(z, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : z = A_i^{(\nu,k)} x\}$  for some constant  $m \times 2$  matrices  $A_i^{(\nu,k)}$ .

For each  $\nu$  and  $k$ , let

$$(4.53) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)} = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_i} \llbracket P_{i,\ell}^{(\nu,k)} \rrbracket$$

where

$$P_{i,\ell}^{(\nu,k)} = \{(z, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} : z = A_i^{(\nu,k)} x + E_{\nu,k} \psi_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x)\}.$$

(Thus  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}$  is as constructed in Lemma 4.5 with  $\mathbf{C}^{(\nu,k)}$ ,  $\psi^{(\nu)}$ , and  $E_{\nu,k}$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}_k$ ,  $\psi$  and  $E_k$ ). Note that then, since  $\psi^{(\nu)} \in \mathfrak{L}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(s)$ , we have that  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)} \in \mathcal{C}_{s,\mathbf{q}'}$  for some  $\mathbf{q}' \in \mathfrak{M}_s$ , and by Lemma 4.6 we have

$$(4.54) \quad F_\nu^2 \geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_{\nu,k}^{-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}) d\|T^{(\nu,k)}\| \text{ and}$$

$$(4.55) \quad F_\nu^2 \geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_{\nu,k}^{-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(0) \setminus \{r < 1/32\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T^{(\nu,k)}) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}\|.$$

Observe that by taking  $\psi' = 0$  in (4.47) and applying (4.18) we have that

$$(4.56) \quad F_\nu^2 \leq 2\overline{M}^2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j^{(\nu)}|^2 \leq 2\overline{M}^2$$

whence by (4.54), (4.55), for each  $\nu$  and sufficiently large  $k$  (depending on  $\nu$ ),

$$(4.57) \quad Q^2(T^{(\nu,k)}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \leq 2^{n+3} E_{\nu,k}^2 F_\nu^2 \leq 2^{n+4} \overline{M}^2 E_{\nu,k}^2.$$

We also have from (4.56), (4.18) and the triangle inequality that

$$(4.58) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |\psi_j^{(\nu)}|^2 \leq 4\overline{M}^2 + 2.$$

**Step 2:** We claim the following: *if  $s > p$  (possible only if  $2 \leq p < q$ ) then for each sufficiently large  $\nu$  and sufficiently large  $k$  (depending on  $\nu$ ),*

$$(4.59) \quad Q(T^{(\nu,k)}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \leq C_1 \overline{\beta}_\nu \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{s'=p}^{s-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,s'}} Q(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)),$$

where  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q, \overline{M}) \in (0, \infty)$ . To see this, with  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q, \overline{M})$  to be determined suppose to the contrary that

$$(4.60) \quad Q(T^{(\nu,k)}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) > C_1 \overline{\beta}_\nu \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{s'=p}^{s-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,s'}} Q(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)).$$

For each  $\nu$  and  $k$  choose  $\widehat{s}^{(\nu,k)} \in \{p, \dots, s-1\}$  and a cone  $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)} \in \mathcal{C}_{q, \widehat{s}^{(\nu,k)}}$  such that

$$(4.61) \quad Q(\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) < 2 \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{s'=p}^{s-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,s'}} Q(\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)).$$

Taking  $\mathbf{C}' = \mathbf{C}^{(\nu,k)}$  gives us, in view of the definition (4.53) of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}$ , that

$$Q(\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) < 2Q(\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{C}^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \leq CE_{\nu,k},$$

where  $C = C(n, q, \overline{M}) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. Since  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{C}^{(\nu,k)}$  are supported on unions of distinct planes intersecting along  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , it follows that

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \text{spt } \mathbf{C}^{(\nu,k)} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq CE_{\nu,k}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \overline{M}) \in (0, \infty)$ . Recalling that by Theorem 3.4(a) and condition (4) of Section 4.1 we have  $\text{minsep } \mathbf{C}^{(\nu,k)} \geq c(n, m, q) (\beta^{(\nu,k)})^{-1} E_{\nu,k}$ , we can express  $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}$  as

$$\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)} = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^{\widehat{s}_i^{(\nu,k)}} \widehat{q}_{\ell}^{(\nu,k)} \llbracket \widehat{P}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu,k)} \rrbracket$$

where  $\widehat{s}_i^{(\nu,k)}$  and  $\widehat{q}_i^{(\nu,k)}$  are positive integers such that  $\sum_{i=1}^p \widehat{s}_i^{(\nu,k)} = \widehat{s}^{(\nu,k)}$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^{\widehat{s}_i^{(\nu,k)}} \widehat{q}_{\ell}^{(\nu,k)} = q$  and where  $\widehat{P}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu,k)}$  are distinct oriented planes with

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\widehat{P}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu,k)} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), P_i^{(\nu,k)} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq CE_{\nu,k}$$

for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$  and  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, \widehat{s}_i^{(\nu,k)}\}$ . (Note that we do not claim that  $\sum_{\ell=1}^{\widehat{s}_i^{(\nu,k)}} \widehat{q}_{\ell}^{(\nu,k)} = q_i$ .) Moreover, for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$  and  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, \widehat{s}_i^{(\nu,k)}\}$  there exists a linear function  $\widehat{\psi}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu,k)} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$\widehat{P}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu,k)} = \{(z, x, y) : z = A_i^{(\nu,k)}x + E_{\nu,k}\widehat{\psi}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu,k)}(x)\}.$$

Since  $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}$  has fewer planes than  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}$ , for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$  there exists  $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ ,  $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in \{1, \dots, q_i\}$ , and  $\widehat{\ell} \in \{1, \dots, \widehat{s}_i^{(\nu,k)}\}$  such that  $\psi_{i,\ell_1}^{(\nu)} \neq \psi_{i,\ell_2}^{(\nu)}$  and

$$(4.62) \quad \text{dist}((A_i^{(\nu,k)}x + E_{\nu,k}\psi_{i,\ell_j}^{(\nu)}(x), x, 0), \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}) \geq \frac{1}{2} E_{\nu,k} |\psi_{i,\ell_j}^{(\nu)}(x) - \widehat{\psi}_{i,\widehat{\ell}}^{(\nu,k)}(x)| \text{ for } j = 1, 2.$$

Thus for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ ,  $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in \{1, \dots, q_i\}$ , and  $\widehat{\ell} \in \{1, \dots, \widehat{s}_i^{(\nu,k)}\}$  we have that  $\psi_{i,\ell_1}^{(\nu)} \neq \psi_{i,\ell_2}^{(\nu)}$  and the set  $S = S_{i,\ell_1,\ell_2,\widehat{\ell}}$  of all  $x \in B_{1/4}^2(0)$  for which (4.62) holds true satisfies  $\mathcal{L}^2(S) \geq \pi/(32q^3)$ . By (4.62) for each  $x \in S$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\nu,k} |\psi_{i,\ell_1}^{(\nu)}(x) - \psi_{i,\ell_2}^{(\nu)}(x)| &\leq E_{\nu,k} |\psi_{i,\ell_1}^{(\nu)}(x) - \widehat{\psi}_{i,\widehat{\ell}}^{(\nu,k)}(x)| + E_{\nu,k} |\psi_{i,\ell_2}^{(\nu)}(x) - \widehat{\psi}_{i,\widehat{\ell}}^{(\nu,k)}(x)| \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_i} \text{dist}((A_i^{(\nu,k)}x + E_{\nu,k}\psi_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x), x, y), \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence squaring both sides and integrating over  $(x, y) \in S \times B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0)$ ,

$$E_{\nu,k}^2 \int_{B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0)} \int_S |\psi_{i,\ell_1}^{(\nu)}(x) - \psi_{i,\ell_2}^{(\nu)}(x)|^2 dx dy \leq 4 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}) d\|\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}\|(X).$$

Since  $\psi_{i,\ell_1}^{(\nu)} - \psi_{i,\ell_2}^{(\nu)}$  is a linear function, there exists unit vectors  $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$  such that (4.62) holds true for  $x = v_1, v_2$  and

$$\frac{\pi\omega_{n-2}}{4^{n+1}q^3} E_{\nu,k}^2 |\psi_{i,\ell_1}^{(\nu)}(x) - \psi_{i,\ell_2}^{(\nu)}(x)|^2 \leq 4 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}) d\|\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}\|(X)$$

for  $x = v_1, v_2$  and the angle between  $v_1, v_2$  is  $\geq \pi/(2q^3)$ . Hence

$$(4.63) \quad E_{\nu,k}^2 \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} |\psi_{i,\ell_1}^{(\nu)} - \psi_{i,\ell_2}^{(\nu)}|^2 \leq C E_{\nu,k}^2 \sup_{B_{1/2}(0)} |\psi_{i,\ell_1}^{(\nu)} - \psi_{i,\ell_2}^{(\nu)}|^2 \leq C E_{\nu,k}^2 \int_S |\psi_{i,\ell_1}^{(\nu)} - \psi_{i,\ell_2}^{(\nu)}|^2 \\ \leq C E_{\nu,k}^2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \widehat{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}) d\|\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}\|(X)$$

where  $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. On the other hand, setting  $\psi'_i(x) = \sum_{\{\ell: \psi_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)} \neq \psi_{i,\ell_2}^{(\nu)}\}} \llbracket \psi_{i,\ell}(x) \rrbracket + \sum_{\{\ell: \psi_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)} \equiv \psi_{i,\ell_2}^{(\nu)}\}} \llbracket \psi_{i,\ell_1}(x) \rrbracket$  and  $\psi'_j(x) = \psi_j(x)$  if  $j \neq i$ ,

$$(4.64) \quad \inf_{\psi' \in \bigcup_{s'=p}^{s-1} \Sigma_{p,q}(s')} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(\psi_i^{(\nu)}, \psi'_i)^2 \leq q \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} |\psi_{i,\ell_1}^{(\nu)} - \psi_{i,\ell_2}^{(\nu)}|^2.$$

Combining (4.60), (4.61), (4.63) and (4.64) gives

$$(4.65) \quad Q^2(T^{(\nu,k)}, \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) > c C_1^2 \bar{\beta}_\nu^2 E_{\nu,k}^2 \inf_{\psi' \in \bigcup_{s'=p}^{s-1} \Sigma_{p,q}(s')} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(\psi_i^{(\nu)}, \psi'_i)^2$$

for some constant  $c = c(n, m, q, \bar{M}) > 0$ . Dividing both sides of (4.65) by  $E_{\nu,k}^2$  and letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  using (4.54) and (4.55) gives

$$2 \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}, \psi_i^{(\nu)})^2 \geq c C_1^2 \bar{\beta}_\nu^2 \inf_{\psi' \in \bigcup_{s'=p}^{s-1} \Sigma_{p,q}(s')} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(\psi_i^{(\nu)}, \psi'_i)^2.$$

Hence by the triangle inequality

$$(4.66) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}, \psi_i^{(\nu)})^2 \geq \frac{c C_1^2 \bar{\beta}_\nu^2}{8} \inf_{\psi' \in \bigcup_{s'=p}^{s-1} \Sigma_{p,q}(s')} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}, \psi'_i)^2$$

for all sufficiently large  $\nu$ . Choosing  $C_1 > 4c^{-1/2}$ , (4.66) contradicts (4.48). Therefore, (4.59) must hold true.

**Step 3:** Next we claim the following: *for each sufficiently large  $\nu$  and sufficiently large  $k$  (depending on  $\nu$ )*

$$(4.67) \quad Q(T^{(\nu,k)}, \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \leq C_2 \bar{\beta}_\nu \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{s'=1}^{s-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,s'}} Q(T^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)),$$

where  $C_2 = C_2(n, m, q, \bar{M}) \in (0, \infty)$  is a constant. To see this, note first that for each fixed  $\nu$  we have (by condition (4) of Section 4.1) that

$$Q(T^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{C}^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \leq \bar{\beta}_{\nu,k} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{s'=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,s'}} Q(T^{(\nu,k)}, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0))$$

where  $\bar{\beta}_{\nu,k} \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence in case  $s = p$ , (4.67) (with  $C_2 = 1$  and for sufficiently large  $k$  depending on  $\nu$ ) follows from this and the definition (4.53) of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu,k)}$ . So suppose that  $s > p$ . Let

$\beta_{\star\star} = \beta_{\star\star}(n, m, q) = \min\{\beta_0(n, m, q, p, 3/4, 1/8) : p = 2, \dots, q\}$  where  $\beta_0$  is as in Theorem 3.11. Arguing as in Remark 3.8, we can find  $\bar{s}^{(\nu, k)} \in \{p, \dots, s\}$  and a cone  $\bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)} \in \mathcal{C}_{q, \bar{s}^{(\nu, k)}}$  such that

$$(4.68) \quad Q(T^{(\nu, k)}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \leq 2^{q-1} \beta_{\star\star}^{2-q} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{s'=1}^{s-1} \mathcal{C}_{q, s'}} Q(T^{(\nu, k)}, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)),$$

$$(4.69) \quad Q(T^{(\nu, k)}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \leq \beta_{\star\star} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{s'=1}^{\bar{s}^{(\nu, k)}-1} \mathcal{C}_{q, s'}} Q(T^{(\nu, k)}, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)).$$

(Note that by setting  $\mathbf{C}' = \mathbf{C}^{(\nu, k)}$  in (4.68),  $Q(T^{(\nu, k)}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \leq CE_{\nu, k}$ . Thus by condition (4) of Section 4.1, we must have that  $\bar{s}^{(\nu, k)} \geq p$ .) In light of condition (3) of Section 4.1 and (4.69), we can apply Theorem 3.11 to deduce that

$$(4.70) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } T^{(\nu, k)} \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/4}(0) \cap \{r \geq 1/16\}, \text{spt } \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)} \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/4}(0) \cap \{r \geq 1/16\}) \leq CE(T^{(\nu, k)}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0))$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Since  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}$  are supported on unions of distinct planes intersecting along  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ ,

$$Q^2(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(0) \cap \{r > 1/16\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}\|(X)$$

for some constants  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Noting that by the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}) &\leq \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } T^{(\nu, k)}) \\ &\quad + \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } T^{(\nu, k)} \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/4}(0) \cap \{r \geq 1/16\}, \text{spt } \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)} \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/4}(0) \cap \{r \geq 1/16\}) \end{aligned}$$

for each  $X \in \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)} \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/4}(0) \cap \{r \geq 1/16\}$  and hence using (4.70)

$$(4.71) \quad \begin{aligned} &Q^2(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \\ &\leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(0) \cap \{r > 1/16\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T^{(\nu, k)}) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}\|(X) + CE^2(T^{(\nu, k)}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \\ &\leq CQ^2(T^{(\nu, k)}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) + CQ^2(T^{(\nu, k)}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \end{aligned}$$

for some constants  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Thus combining (4.59), (4.71) and (4.68)

$$\begin{aligned} Q(T^{(\nu, k)}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) &\leq C\bar{\beta}_{\nu} Q(T^{(\nu, k)}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \\ &\quad + C\bar{\beta}_{\nu} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{s'=1}^{s-1} \mathcal{C}_{q, s'}} Q(T^{(\nu, k)}, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C = C(n, m, q, \bar{M}) \in (0, \infty)$ , which, provided  $C\bar{\beta}_{\nu} < 1/2$ , proves (4.67).

**Step 4:** *Fine blow up relative to the cones associated with  $\psi^{(\nu)}$ .* Using (4.67) and the fact that condition (6) in Section 4.1 holds with  $T^{(\nu, k)}$  in place  $T$ , we can now verify (by arguing as in [Wic14, pp. 910-914]) the following: for sufficiently large  $\nu$  and  $k$ , (4.67) holds with  $\eta_{0,1/2\#} T^{(\nu, k)}$  in place of  $T^{(\nu, k)}$  and with a larger but fixed constant (depending only on  $n, m, q, \bar{M}$ ) in place of  $C_2$ , and condition (6) in Section 4.1 holds with  $\eta_{0,1/2\#} T^{(\nu, k)}$  in place of  $T$  and  $CM$  in place of  $M$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q)$ . This allows us to apply Corollary 3.18 with  $\eta_{0,1/2\#} T^{(\nu, k)}$  in place of  $T$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}$  to deduce that for any  $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ ,

$$(4.72) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(0) \cap \{r < \delta\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}) d\|T^{(\nu, k)}\|(X) \leq C_1 \delta \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k)}) d\|T^{(\nu, k)}\|(X)$$

for all sufficiently large  $\nu$  and  $k$  (depending on  $\delta$ ), where  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q, M)$ . Using Theorem 3.11 (applied to the left hand side of this), dividing both sides by  $E_{\nu, k}^2$  and letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  (for fixed  $\nu$ ), we obtain with the help of Lemma 4.6 (applied to the right hand side) that for all sufficiently large  $\nu$ ,

$$(4.73) \quad \int_{B_{1/4}(0) \cap \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}, \psi_i^{(\nu)})^2 \leq C_1 \delta \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}, \psi_i^{(\nu)})^2 = C_1 \delta F_\nu^2$$

where  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q, M)$ .

Select diagonal sequences  $T^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$ ,  $\mathbf{C}^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$  by choosing  $k = k(\nu)$  large enough such that conditions (1)-(8) of Section 4.1 and condition (4.1) are satisfied with  $T^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$ ,  $\mathbf{C}^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$  in place of  $T_k$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k$ ; with  $p_k = p$ ,  $q_j^{(k)} = q_j$  and with  $\epsilon^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$ ,  $\beta^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$ ,  $\eta^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$ ,  $\delta^{(\nu, k(\nu))} \downarrow 0$  (as  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ ) in place of  $\epsilon_k$ ,  $\beta_k$ ,  $\eta_k$ ,  $\delta_k$  respectively. Furthermore, by taking  $\nu$  large enough, in view of (4.51), (4.54), (4.55) and the claim in Step 3, we may, and shall, require also that

$$(4.74) \quad \sum_{i=1}^p \int_{B_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{r < \nu^{-1}\}} \mathcal{G}\left(\frac{u_i^{(\nu, k(\nu))}}{E_{\nu, k(\nu)}}, w_i^{(\nu)}\right)^2 < \frac{1}{\nu} F_\nu^2;$$

$$(4.75) \quad \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_{\nu, k(\nu)}^2 F_\nu^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k(\nu))}) d\|T^{(\nu, k(\nu))}\| \leq 1;$$

$$(4.76) \quad \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{E_{\nu, k(\nu)}^2 F_\nu^2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/4}(0) \setminus \{r < 1/32\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T^{(\nu, k(\nu))}) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k(\nu))}\| \leq 1 \quad \text{and}$$

(4.77) either (i)  $s = p$  or (ii)  $s > p$  and

$$Q(T^{(\nu, k(\nu))}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k(\nu))}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \leq C \bar{\beta}_\nu \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \bigcup_{s'=1}^{s-1} \bigcup_{\mathbf{q}' \in \mathfrak{M}_{s'}} \mathcal{C}_{s', \mathbf{q}'}} Q(T^{(\nu, k(\nu))}, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)),$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, \bar{M})$ . Here  $E_{\nu, k(\nu)}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$ ,  $u_i^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$  are as in (4.50), (4.53), (4.51) with  $k = k(\nu)$ . Set  $T^{(\nu)} = T^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$ ,  $\mathbf{C}^{(\nu)} = \mathbf{C}^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$ ,  $u_i^{(\nu)} = u_i^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu)} = \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$ ,  $E_\nu = E_{\nu, k(\nu)}$ ,  $\epsilon_\nu = \epsilon^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$ ,  $\beta_\nu = \beta^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$ ,  $\eta_\nu = \eta^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$  and  $\delta_\nu = \delta^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$ . After relabelling, assume the above hold for  $\nu = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ . Write

$$(4.78) \quad \mathbf{C}^{(\nu)} = \sum_{i=1}^p q_i \llbracket P_i^{(\nu)} \rrbracket$$

where  $P_i^{(\nu)} = P_i^{(\nu, k(\nu))}$ , with  $P_i^{(\nu, k)} = \{(z, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} : z = A_i^{(\nu, k)} x\}$  as in (4.52), where  $A_i^{(\nu, k)}$  is a constant  $(m \times 2)$  matrix. By the definition of  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu)}$  (see (4.53)), we can write

$$(4.79) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu)} = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^{m_i^{(\nu)}} \tilde{q}_{i, \ell}^{(\nu)} \llbracket \tilde{P}_{i, \ell}^{(\nu)} \rrbracket$$

where  $m_i^{(\nu)}$  are integers  $\geq 1$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^p m_i^{(\nu)} = s$ ,  $\tilde{q}_{i, \ell}^{(\nu)}$  are integers  $\geq 1$  with  $\sum_{\ell=1}^{m_i^{(\nu)}} \tilde{q}_{i, \ell}^{(\nu)} = q_i$  and  $\tilde{P}_{i, \ell}^{(\nu)}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq p$ ,  $1 \leq \ell \leq m_i^{(\nu)}$ ) are distinct planes such that for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$  and  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m_i^{(\nu)}\}$ ,

$$\text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}^{(\nu)}) = \text{dist}(X, P_i^{(\nu)}) \quad \forall X \in \tilde{P}_{i, \ell}^{(\nu)}.$$

By passing to a subsequence without changing notation, we may and shall assume that for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ ,  $m_i^{(\nu)} = m_i$  for some fixed integer  $m_i \geq 1$  and all  $\nu = 1, 2, \dots$ , and also for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$  and  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m_i\}$  that  $\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)} = \tilde{q}_{i,\ell}$  some fixed integer  $\tilde{q}_{i,\ell} \geq 1$  and all  $\nu = 1, 2, \dots$ .

In view of (4.77), all conditions necessary to produce a fine blow-up of (a subsequence of)  $(\eta_{0,1/2\#} T^{(\nu)})$  relative to the (corresponding subsequence of) cones  $(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu)})$  are met. Thus, without relabelling subsequences, by the definition of fine blow-up, for each  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  we find a sequence  $(\tilde{\tau}_\nu)$  with  $\tilde{\tau}_\nu \rightarrow 0^+$  and functions  $\tilde{u}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)} : B_\gamma(0) \setminus \{r < \tilde{\tau}_\nu\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  ( $1 \leq i \leq p$ ,  $1 \leq \ell \leq m_i$ ) with  $(\tilde{\tau}_\nu)$  and  $(\tilde{u}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)})$  corresponding to the sequences  $(\tau_k)$ ,  $(u_j^{(k)})$  respectively as in the discussion of Section 4.1 taken with  $T = \eta_{0,1/2\#} T^{(\nu)}$  and  $\mathbf{C} = \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu)}$ . Moreover, we obtain  $\tilde{w} \in \mathfrak{B}_{s,\tilde{q}}$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{q}} = (\tilde{q}_{1,1}, \dots, \tilde{q}_{1,m_1}, \tilde{q}_{2,1}, \dots, \tilde{q}_{2,m_2}, \dots, \tilde{q}_{p,1}, \dots, \tilde{q}_{p,m_p})$ , which can be written as

$$\tilde{w}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^{m_i} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}} [\tilde{w}_{i,\ell,j}(x)]$$

with  $\tilde{w}_{i,\ell,j}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  for  $x \in B_1(0)$ , such that for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$  and each  $\ell = 1, 2, \dots$ ,

$$(4.80) \quad \tilde{E}_\nu^{-1} \tilde{u}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)} \rightarrow \tilde{w}_{i,\ell}$$

as  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ , where

$$\tilde{E}_\nu^2 = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu)}) d\|T^{(\nu)}\|,$$

$\tilde{w}_{i,\ell}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}} [\tilde{w}_{i,\ell,j}(x)]$  and (by (4.16)) the convergence is in  $L^2(B_\gamma; \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}}(\mathbb{R}^m))$  and locally in  $W^{1,2}(B_\gamma(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}; \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}}(\mathbb{R}^m))$ . Similarly, passing to further subsequences without relabelling, we also obtain (see Remark 4.4) a fine blow up  $w = (w_1, \dots, w_p) \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$  of  $(\eta_{0,1/2\#} T^{(\nu)})$  with respect to the sequence of cones  $(\mathbf{C}^{(\nu)})$ , giving

$$(4.81) \quad \frac{2u_i^{(\nu)}(x/2)}{E(T^{(\nu)}, \mathbf{C}^{(\nu)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0))} \rightarrow w_i(x)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , where the convergence is in  $L^2(B_\gamma; \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{q}_i}(\mathbb{R}^m))$  and locally in  $W^{1,2}(B_\gamma(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}; \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{q}_i}(\mathbb{R}^m))$ .

Now note that by Theorem 3.11 and the definition of  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu)}$  (as in (4.53)), we have that for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ ,  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m_i\}$  and  $x \in B_\gamma(0) \cap \tilde{K}^{(\nu)} \cap (2K^{(\nu)})$ ,

$$(4.82) \quad 2u_i^{(\nu)}(x/2) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{m_i} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}} [\tilde{u}_{i,\ell,j}^{(\nu)}(x) + E_\nu \tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x)]$$

where  $\tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is the linear function such that  $\text{graph}(A_i^{(\nu)}x + E_\nu \tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x)) = \tilde{P}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}$  (so that for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ ,  $\tilde{\psi}_{i,1}^{(\nu)}, \tilde{\psi}_{i,2}^{(\nu)}, \dots, \tilde{\psi}_{i,m_i}^{(\nu)}$  are the distinct functions among  $\psi_{i,1}^{(\nu)}, \dots, \psi_{i,q_i}^{(\nu)}$ ,  $A_i^{(\nu)} = A_i^{(\nu,k^{(\nu)})}$ , and  $K^{(\nu)}, \tilde{K}^{(\nu)}$  are the sets corresponding to  $K$  in Theorem 3.11 taken with, respectively, the pair  $T^{(\nu)}, \mathbf{C}^{(\nu)}$  or the pair  $\eta_{0,1/2\#} T^{(\nu)}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{(\nu)}$ . By (4.58) we see that there are linear functions  $\tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  with  $\tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)} \rightarrow \tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}$  locally uniformly. In view of the fact that  $\sum_{j=1}^p \int_{B_1(0)} |w_j^{(\nu)}|^2 \leq 1$ , compactness for locally Dirichlet energy minimizing functions implies that for each  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , there is  $w'_i : B_1(0) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  which is locally Dirichlet energy minimizing in  $B_1(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  such that (in view of (4.6))  $w_i^{(\nu)} \rightarrow w'_i$  locally in  $L^2(B_1(0); \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m))$  and also locally uniformly

in  $B_1(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . By (4.56), (4.74) and (4.81), it then follows that  $2w_i^{(\nu)}(x/2) = cw_i(x)$  for  $x \in B_\gamma(0)$  and  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , where  $c = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} E_\nu^{-1} E(T^{(\nu)}, \mathbf{C}^{(\nu)}, \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)) \in [0, 2^{n+2}]$ , so that

$$(4.83) \quad w_i^{(\nu)}(x) \rightarrow \frac{c}{2} w_i(2x)$$

as  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$  in  $L^2(B_{1/2}(0); \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m))$  and locally uniformly in  $B_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ .

By (4.75) and (4.56) we see that, passing to a subsequence,  $(E_\nu)^{-1} \tilde{E}_\nu \rightarrow \tilde{c}$  for some  $\tilde{c} \in [0, 2^{n+2} \overline{M}]$ . Thus, dividing (4.82) by  $E_\nu$  and letting  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain that

$$(4.84) \quad cw_i(x) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{m_i} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}} [\tilde{c} \tilde{w}_{i,\ell,j}(x) + \tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}(x)]$$

for  $\mathcal{H}^n$  a.e.  $x \in B_\gamma(0)$ .

Consider the case  $\tilde{c} = 0$  (which will be the case if option (ii) in (4.77) holds). Then by (4.84)  $c \neq 0$  and  $w_i^{(\nu)}(\cdot) \rightarrow \sum_{\ell=1}^{m_i} \tilde{q}_{i,\ell} [\tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}(\cdot)]$  locally uniformly in  $B_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Hence by passing to a subsequence we can write

$$(4.85) \quad w_i^{(\nu)} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{m_i} w_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}$$

on  $B_{1/2} \setminus \{r < \nu^{-1}\}$  where for each  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $\ell = 1, \dots, m_i$ ,  $w_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)} : B_{1/2} \setminus \{r < \nu^{-1}\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  is locally Dirichlet energy minimizing with  $w_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(\cdot) \rightarrow \tilde{q}_{i,\ell} [\tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}(\cdot)]$  locally uniformly in  $B_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Write  $w_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}} [w_{i,\ell,j}^{(\nu)}(x)]$  where  $w_{i,\ell,j}^{(\nu)}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , and define

$$(4.86) \quad \bar{w}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}} [w_{i,\ell,j}^{(\nu)}(x) - \tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x)], \quad x \in B_{1/2} \setminus \{r < \nu^{-1}\}.$$

Then  $\bar{w}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x)$  is locally Dirichlet energy minimizing in  $B_{1/2} \setminus \{r < \nu^{-1}\}$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,\ell} \int_{B_{1/2} \setminus \{r < \nu^{-1}\}} |\bar{w}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}|^2 &= \sum_{i,\ell} \int_{B_{1/2} \setminus \{r < \nu^{-1}\}} \mathcal{G}(w_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x), \tilde{q}_{i,\ell} [\tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x)])^2 dx \\ &= \sum_i \int_{B_{1/2} \setminus \{r < \nu^{-1}\}} \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}(x), \psi_i^{(\nu)}(x))^2 dx \leq F_\nu^2, \end{aligned}$$

so for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ ,  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m_i\}$ , there exists  $\bar{v}_{i,\ell} \in L^2(B_{1/2}; \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}}(\mathbb{R}^m)) \cap W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_{1/2} \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}; \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}}(\mathbb{R}^m))$  such that  $\bar{v}_{i,\ell}$  is continuous and locally Dirichlet energy minimizing in  $B_{1/2} \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  and  $F_\nu^{-1} \bar{w}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)} \rightarrow \bar{v}_{i,\ell}$  locally in  $L^2(B_{1/2} \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}; \mathcal{A}_{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}}(\mathbb{R}^m))$  and locally uniformly in  $B_{1/2} \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . If  $\tilde{c} \neq 0$ , then option (i) in (4.77) (i.e. that  $s = p$ ) must hold, in which case (4.84), (4.85) hold with  $m_i = 1$  for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ ,  $\ell = 1$  and  $\tilde{q}_{i,\ell} = q_i$  for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$  (and possibly with  $c = 0$  in (4.84)); moreover, defining  $\bar{w}^{(\nu)}$  by (4.86) (with  $\tilde{q}_{i,\ell} = q_i$ ,  $w_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)} = w_i^{(\nu)}$  and  $\tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)} = \psi_i^{(\nu)}$ ), we still obtain  $\bar{v}_{i,\ell} \equiv \bar{v}_i$  as above.

**Step 5:** *Non-triviality of the fine blow up relative to the cones associated with  $\psi^{(\nu)}$ , its homogeneity, and the contradiction that completes the proof.* By the regularity theory for locally Dirichlet energy minimizing functions ([Alm83]), there is a closed set  $\Sigma_i^{(\nu)} \subset B_{1/2}(0)$  (consisting of the union of the singular set of  $w_i^{(\nu)} \llcorner (B_{1/2} \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}))$  and  $B_{1/2} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})$ ) of Hausdorff dimension  $\leq n - 2$  such that locally about any point  $y \in B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_i^{(\nu)}$ , the function  $w_i^{(\nu)}$  is given by  $q_i$  smooth



$\mathbb{R}^m$ -valued harmonic functions. Letting  $\sigma_i^{(\nu)} \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  be the radial projection of  $\Sigma_i^{(\nu)} \cap (B_{1/2} \setminus B_{1/8})$  into  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , we then have that  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\sigma_i^{(\nu)}) \leq n-2$  and that for each  $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \setminus \sigma_i^{(\nu)}$ , there is a simply connected neighborhood  $K_\omega$  of  $\{t\omega : t \in [1/8, 1/2]\}$  such that  $w_i^{(\nu)} \llcorner K_\omega$  decomposes as  $g_i$  smooth  $\mathbb{R}^m$ -valued functions on  $K_\omega$ . Using this decomposition, we see that for each  $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-2} \setminus \sigma_i^{(\nu)}$  and  $1/8 \leq \rho_1 \leq \rho_2 \leq 1/2$ ,  $\mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}(\rho_2\omega)/\rho_2, w_i^{(\nu)}(\rho_1\omega)/\rho_1) \leq \int_{1/8}^{1/2} \left| \frac{\partial(w_i^{(\nu)}/R)(t\omega)}{\partial R} \right| dt$ . Hence for any  $\psi' = (\psi'_1, \dots, \psi'_p) \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ , we have by homogeneity of  $\psi'_i$ , triangle inequality and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\frac{\mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}(\rho_2\omega), \psi'_i(\rho_2\omega))^2}{\rho_2^2} \leq \frac{2\mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}(\rho_1\omega), \psi'_i(\rho_1\omega))^2}{\rho_1^2} + \frac{9 \cdot 8^{n-1}}{32} \int_{1/8}^{1/2} t^{n-1} \left| \frac{\partial(w_i^{(\nu)}/R)(t\omega)}{\partial R} \right|^2 dt.$$

Multiplying this by  $\rho_2^{n+1}$  and integrating with respect to  $\rho_2 \in [1/8, 1/2]$ , and then multiplying the resulting inequality by  $\rho_1^{n+1}$  and integrating with respect to  $\rho_1 \in [1/8, 1/4]$ , followed by integration with respect to  $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \setminus \sigma_i^{(\nu)}$ , adding  $\int_{B_{1/8}} \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}(x), \psi'_i(x))^2 dx$  to both sides and summing over  $i$ , we obtain that

$$(4.87) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}(x), \psi'_i(x))^2 dx \leq C \int_{B_{1/4}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}(x), \psi'_i(x))^2 dx + C \int_{B_{1/2}(0) \setminus B_{1/8}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \left| \frac{\partial(w_i^{(\nu)}/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2$$

for each  $\nu$  and any  $\psi' \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ , where  $C = C(n)$ . On the other hand, choosing  $\delta > 0$  in (4.73) such that  $CC_1\delta < 1/2$  (where  $C, C_1$  are as in (4.87), (4.73) respectively) and combining (4.73) and (4.87) taken with  $\psi' = \psi^{(\nu)}$  gives

$$F_\nu^2 \leq 2C \int_{B_{1/4} \setminus \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}(x), \psi_i^{(\nu)}(x))^2 dx + 2C \int_{B_{1/2}(0) \setminus B_{1/8}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \left| \frac{\partial(w_i^{(\nu)}/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2.$$

Dividing this by  $F_\nu^2$ , using (4.49) and letting  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ , we see that

$$\int_{B_{1/4} \setminus \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^{m_i} |\bar{v}_{i,\ell}|^2 = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} F_\nu^{-2} \int_{B_{1/4} \setminus \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}(x), \psi_i^{(\nu)}(x))^2 dx \geq (2C)^{-1},$$

and in particular  $\sum_{i,\ell} |\bar{v}_{i,\ell}|^2 \neq 0$ . Again by (4.49) and the fact that  $\tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}$  is homogeneous of degree 1, it follows that for each  $\delta \in (0, 1/4)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{(B_{1/2}(0) \setminus B_{1/8}(0)) \setminus \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^{m_i} \left| \frac{\partial(\bar{v}_{i,\ell}/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 \\ & \leq \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} F_\nu^{-2} \int_{(B_{1/2}(0) \setminus B_{1/8}(0)) \setminus \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^{m_i} \left| \frac{\partial(\bar{w}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 \\ & = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow 0} F_\nu^{-2} \int_{(B_{1/2}(0) \setminus B_{1/8}(0)) \setminus \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \left| \frac{\partial(w_i^{(\nu)}/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for each  $i$  and  $\ell$ ,  $\frac{\partial(\bar{v}_{i,\ell}/R)}{\partial R} = 0$  at  $\mathcal{H}^n$ -a.e.  $X \in B_{1/2}(0) \setminus B_{1/8}(0)$  and hence  $\bar{v}_{i,\ell}$  is homogeneous of degree 1 in  $(B_{1/2}(0) \setminus B_{1/8}(0)) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . Now by (4.82) and (4.74) we see that for any

$\delta \in (0, 1/4)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_\gamma(0) \setminus \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i,\ell} \mathcal{G} \left( \frac{\tilde{u}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x)}{E_\nu F_\nu}, \frac{2\bar{w}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x/2)}{F_\nu} \right)^2 \\
&= F_\nu^{-2} \int_{B_\gamma(0) \setminus \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i,\ell} \mathcal{G} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}} \llbracket E_\nu^{-1} \tilde{u}_{i,\ell,j}^{(\nu)}(x) + \tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x) \rrbracket, \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}} \llbracket 2w_{i,\ell,j}^{(\nu)}(x/2) \rrbracket \right)^2 \\
&= 4F_\nu^{-2} \int_{B_\gamma(0) \setminus \{r < \delta\}} \sum_i \mathcal{G} \left( E_\nu^{-1} u_i^{(\nu)}(x/2), w_i^{(\nu)}(x/2) \right)^2 \rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}$$

as  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ , and hence by (4.80)  $\bar{c} \tilde{w}_{i,\ell} = \bar{v}_{i,\ell}$  on  $B_{1/2} \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  where the constant  $\bar{c} = \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} (E_\nu F_\nu)^{-1} \bar{E}_\nu \in [0, 2^{n+2}]$  (where the limit exists, after passing to a subsequence, by (4.75)). Since  $\sum_{i,\ell} |\bar{v}_{i,\ell}|^2 \neq 0$ , it follows that  $\bar{c} > 0$ , and hence, since the homogeneous degree 1 extension of  $\tilde{w}_\nu((B_{1/2} \setminus B_{1/8}) \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2})$  is locally Dirichlet energy minimizing in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , it follows from unique continuation for locally Dirichlet energy minimizing functions that  $\tilde{w}$  is (non-zero and) homogeneous of degree 1 in  $B_1 \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ . By Theorem 4.8, we then have  $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{s,\tilde{\mathbf{q}}}$  so that  $\tilde{w}_{i,\ell}(x, y) = \sum_{k=1}^{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}} \llbracket \tilde{\varphi}_{i,\ell,k}(x, y) \rrbracket$  where  $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,\ell,k} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  are single valued linear functions of the form  $\tilde{\varphi}_{i,\ell,k}(x, y) = \varphi_{i,\ell,k}(x) + L_1(y) + A_{i,\ell} L_2(y)$ ,  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , where  $\varphi_{i,\ell,k} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  are linear functions such that: for  $k_1 \neq k_2$ , either  $\varphi_{i,\ell,k_1}(x) \equiv \varphi_{i,\ell,k_2}(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$  or  $\varphi_{i,\ell,k_1}(x) \neq \varphi_{i,\ell,k_2}(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ ;  $L_1 : \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $L_2 : \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  are linear functions, and  $A_{i,\ell}$  are constant  $m \times 2$  matrices. By the triangle inequality, we then have  $\int_{B_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{r < \nu^{-1}\}} \sum_{i,\ell} \mathcal{G} \left( \frac{\bar{w}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}}{F_\nu}, \bar{c} \tilde{\varphi}_{i,\ell} \right)^2 \rightarrow 0$  as  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ , which by the definition of  $\bar{w}^{(\nu)}$ , says that

$$F_\nu^{-2} \int_{B_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{r < \nu^{-1}\}} \sum_{i,\ell} \mathcal{G} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}} \llbracket w_{i,\ell,k}^{(\nu)}(x, y) - \tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x) \rrbracket, \bar{c} F_\nu \sum_{k=1}^{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}} \llbracket \tilde{\varphi}_{i,\ell,k}(x, y) \rrbracket \right)^2 \rightarrow 0$$

as  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ . If we define  $\bar{\psi}_i^{(\nu)} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  by  $\bar{\psi}_i^{(\nu)}(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{m_i} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{q}_{i,\ell}} \llbracket \tilde{\psi}_{i,\ell}^{(\nu)}(x) + \bar{c} F_\nu (\varphi_{i,\ell,j}(x) + L_1(y) + A_{i,\ell} L_2(y)) \rrbracket$  and set  $\bar{\psi}^{(\nu)} = (\bar{\psi}_1^{(\nu)}, \dots, \bar{\psi}_p^{(\nu)})$ , then  $\bar{\psi}^{(\nu)} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$  and the above says

$$(4.88) \quad F_\nu^{-2} \int_{B_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{r < \nu^{-1}\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G} \left( w_i^{(\nu)}, \bar{\psi}_i^{(\nu)} \right)^2 \rightarrow 0.$$

By (4.87) taken with  $\psi' = \bar{\psi}^{(\nu)}$  we have that for any  $\delta \in (0, 1/4)$  and sufficiently large  $\nu$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.89) \quad & \int_{B_{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}, \bar{\psi}_i^{(\nu)})^2 dx \leq C \int_{B_{1/4} \cap \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}, \bar{\psi}_i^{(\nu)})^2 dx \\
& + C \int_{B_{1/4}(0) \setminus \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}, \bar{\psi}_i^{(\nu)})^2 dx + C \int_{B_{1/2}(0) \setminus B_{1/8}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \left| \frac{\partial(w_i^{(\nu)}/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 \\
& \leq 2C \int_{B_{1/4} \cap \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}, \psi_i^{(\nu)})^2 dx + 2C \int_{B_{1/4} \cap \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(\psi_i^{(\nu)}, \bar{\psi}_i^{(\nu)})^2 dx \\
& + C \int_{B_{1/4}(0) \setminus \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}, \bar{\psi}_i^{(\nu)})^2 dx + C \int_{B_{1/2}(0) \setminus B_{1/8}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \left| \frac{\partial(w_i^{(\nu)}/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 \\
& \leq 2CC_1 \delta F_\nu^2 + C \int_{B_{1/4}(0) \setminus \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}, \bar{\psi}_i^{(\nu)})^2 dx + C \int_{B_{1/2}(0) \setminus B_{1/8}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \left| \frac{\partial(w_i^{(\nu)}/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n)$ ,  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q)$  and the last inequality follows from (4.73) and the fact that, since  $\bar{\psi}^{(\nu)} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,q}$  satisfies (4.88),

$$\int_{B_{1/4} \cap \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(\psi_i^{(\nu)}, \bar{\psi}_i^{(\nu)})^2 dx \leq C\delta^2 \int_{B_{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(\psi_i^{(\nu)}, \bar{\psi}_i^{(\nu)})^2 dx \leq C\delta^2 F_\nu^2$$

for some  $C = C(n)$ . Taking  $\psi' = \bar{\psi}^{(\nu)}$  in (4.47) and using (4.89), we then have that

$$F_\nu^2 \leq 4CC_1 \delta \bar{M} F_\nu^2 + C \int_{B_{1/4}(0) \setminus \{r < \delta\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_i^{(\nu)}, \bar{\psi}_i^{(\nu)})^2 dx + C \int_{B_{1/2}(0) \setminus B_{1/8}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \left| \frac{\partial(w_i^{(\nu)}/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2.$$

In view of (4.49) and (4.88), dividing this by  $F_\nu^2$  and letting  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$  leads to a contradiction if we choose  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, \bar{M})$  such that  $4CC_1 \delta \bar{M} = 1/2$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.9.* Let  $w \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,q}(M)$  and  $\psi \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,q}$  be as in the lemma, and let  $(T_k)$ ,  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$  be sequences corresponding to  $w$  as in Definition 4.1. By considering a fine blow up of appropriately rotated  $T_k$  (as in the proof of Theorem 4.8), we may assume without loss of generality that  $\psi \in \mathfrak{L}_{p,q}$ .

Let  $\bar{\beta} = \bar{\beta}(n, m, q, M, \bar{M})$ ,  $\bar{C} = \bar{C}(n, m, q, M, \bar{M})$  be the constants as in Lemma 4.10 (which depend only on  $n, m, q, M$  and the parameter  $\bar{M} \geq 1$ ). For  $i \in \{1, \dots, q - p + 1\}$ , inductively define  $\beta_i$  and  $C_i$  by setting  $\beta_1 = \bar{\beta}(n, m, q, M, 1)$  and  $C_1 = \bar{C}(n, m, q, M, 1)$ , and for each  $i \geq 2$ ,  $\beta_i = \bar{\beta}(n, m, q, M, M_i)$  and  $C_i = 2\bar{C}(n, m, q, M, M_i)$  where  $M_i = 2^{i-1}(\beta_1 \beta_2 \cdots \beta_{i-1})^{-2}$ .

Observe that (4.45) with  $\bar{M} = 1$  holds true by hypothesis of the present lemma. If either  $d(\psi) = p$ , or if  $d(\psi) > p$  and  $w$  and  $\psi$  satisfy (4.46) with  $\bar{\beta} = \beta_1$ , then by Lemma 4.10,  $w$  and  $\psi$  satisfy (4.44) with  $C = C_1$ . If instead  $d(\psi) > p$  and  $w$  and  $\psi$  do not satisfy (4.46) with  $\bar{\beta} = \beta_1$ , then for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, i_0$  inductively select  $\psi^{(i)} \in \mathfrak{L}_{p,q}(s_i)$  such that when  $i = 1$  we have  $p \leq s_1 < d(\psi)$  and

$$\int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j^{(1)})^2 < 2 \inf_{\psi' \in \bigcup_{s'=p}^{d(\psi)-1} \mathfrak{L}_{p,q}(s')} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j')^2$$

and for each  $i \geq 2$  we have  $p \leq s_i < s_{i-1}$  and

$$\int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j^{(i)})^2 < 2 \inf_{\psi' \in \bigcup_{s'=p}^{s_{i-1}-1} \mathfrak{L}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(s')} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi'_j)^2$$

and terminate either when  $i$  equals the smallest  $i_0$  for which  $s_{i_0} > p$  and

$$(4.90) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j^{(i_0)})^2 \leq \beta_{i_0+1}^2 \inf_{\psi' \in \bigcup_{s'=p}^{s_{i_0}-1} \mathfrak{L}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(s')} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi'_j)^2$$

or (if no such  $i_0$  exists) when  $i$  equals the value  $i_0$  for which  $s_{i_0} = p$ . By choice of  $\psi^{(i)}$ , one readily checks that  $\psi^{(i_0)}$  satisfies

$$(4.91) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j)^2 &\leq 2 \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j^{(i_0)})^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2^{i_0}}{\beta_1^2 \beta_2^2 \cdots \beta_{i_0}^2} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from (4.43) and the second inequality follows by the construction of  $\psi^{(i)}$ , including the failure, when  $i < i_0$ , of (4.90) with  $i$  in place of  $i_0$ . Using Lemma 4.10 and (4.91) gives us

$$\int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j)^2 \leq 2 \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j^{(i_0)})^2 \leq 2C_{i_0} \int_{B_{1/2}(0) \setminus B_{1/8}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^p \left| \frac{\partial(w_i/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2.$$

□

**Lemma 4.11.** *Let  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathfrak{M}_p$  and  $M \geq 1$ . Let  $w \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(M)$ . For each  $\vartheta \in (0, 1/8]$ , let  $\psi^{(\vartheta)}$  be any element in  $\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$  such that  $\int_{B_\vartheta(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j^{(\vartheta)})^2 \leq 2 \inf_{\psi' \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}} \int_{B_\vartheta(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi'_j)^2$ . Then for each  $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2$  with  $0 < \vartheta_1 \leq \vartheta_2 \leq 1/8$ ,*

$$(4.92) \quad \vartheta_1^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\vartheta_1}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j^{(\vartheta_1)})^2 \leq C \left( \frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_2} \right)^{2\mu} \vartheta_2^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\vartheta_2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j^{(\vartheta_2)})^2,$$

where  $\mu \in (0, 1)$  and  $C \in (0, \infty)$  depend only on  $n, m, q$  and  $M$  (in particular independent of  $\vartheta_1$  and  $\vartheta_2$ ).

*Proof.* Let  $\rho \in [\vartheta_1, 1/2]$ . By (4.25) with  $\psi^{(\rho)}$  in place of  $\psi$ ,

$$(4.93) \quad \int_{B_{\rho/4}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p R^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial(w_j/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 \leq C \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j^{(\rho)})^2$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . Let  $T_k, \mathbf{C}_k$  be as in Definition 4.1 such that  $w$  is the blow-up of  $T_k$  relative to  $\mathbf{C}_k$  (by the excess  $E_k = \sqrt{\int_{B_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|T_k\|}$ ). We may assume that  $w|_{B_{\vartheta_1}} \neq 0$  (else there is nothing to prove) and hence  $w|_{B_\rho} \neq 0$ . By Remark 4.4, we have that  $w_1 \equiv \|w(\rho(\cdot))\|_{L^2(B_1(0))}^{-1} w(\rho(\cdot)) \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(CM)$  for some  $C = C(n, m, q)$ . Hence by applying Lemma 4.9 to  $w_1$ , we see that

$$(4.94) \quad \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j^{(\rho)})^2 \leq C \int_{B_\rho(0) \setminus B_{\rho/4}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p R^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial(w_j/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q, M) \in (0, \infty)$ . Thus by (4.93) and (4.94),

$$(4.95) \quad \int_{B_{\rho/4}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p R^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial(w_j/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 \leq C_0 \int_{B_{\rho}(0) \setminus B_{\rho/4}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p R^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial(w_j/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2$$

for all  $\rho \in [\vartheta_1, 1/2]$  and some constant  $C_0 = C_0(n, m, q, M) \in (0, \infty)$ . By adding  $C_0$  times the left-hand side of (4.95) to both sides of (4.95),

$$(4.96) \quad \int_{B_{\rho/4}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p R^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial(w_j/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 \leq \gamma \int_{B_{\rho}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p R^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial(w_j/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2$$

for all  $\rho \in [\vartheta_1, 1/2]$ , where  $\gamma = C_0/(1 + C_0) \in (0, 1)$ . Noting that the assertion of the lemma easily follows if  $\vartheta_1 \geq \vartheta_2/32$ , we may assume that  $\vartheta_1 < \vartheta_2/32$  and iteratively apply (4.96) with  $\rho = 2^{-2i-1}\vartheta_2$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$ , where  $N$  is the positive integer such that  $2^{-2N-3}\vartheta_2 < \vartheta_1 \leq 2^{-2N-1}\vartheta_2$ , to obtain

$$(4.97) \quad \int_{B_{\vartheta_1}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p R^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial(w_j/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2 \leq C \left( \frac{\vartheta_1}{\vartheta_2} \right)^{2\mu} \int_{B_{\vartheta_2/8}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p R^{2-n} \left| \frac{\partial(w_j/R)}{\partial R} \right|^2,$$

where  $\mu = -\log \gamma / \log 16$  and  $C = C(n, m, q, M)$ . By combining (4.93) with  $\rho = \vartheta_2/2$ , (4.94) with  $\rho = \vartheta_1$ , and (4.97), we obtain (4.92).  $\square$

**Theorem 4.12.** *Let  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_p) \in \mathfrak{M}_p$ ,  $M \geq 1$  and  $w \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(M)$ . There exists unique  $\tilde{\psi} = (\tilde{\psi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\psi}_p) \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$  such that*

$$(4.98) \quad \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\rho}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \tilde{\psi}_j)^2 \leq C \rho^{2\mu} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2,$$

for all  $\rho \in (0, 1/8]$ , where  $\mu \in (0, 1)$  and  $C \in (0, \infty)$  depend only on  $n, m, q$  and  $M$ . Additionally,

(i) we have that

$$(4.99) \quad \int_{B_1(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |\tilde{\psi}_j|^2 \leq \bar{C}$$

for some constant  $\bar{C} = \bar{C}(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ , and

(ii) there are  $\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_p) \in \mathfrak{L}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$ , constant  $(m \times 2)$  matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_p$  and two linear functions  $L_1 : \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $L_2 : \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  with

$$(4.100) \quad \sum_{j=1}^p \|A_j\| + \|L_1\| + \|L_2\| \leq C$$

for some  $C = C(n, m, q)$  such that  $w \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(M, A_1, \dots, A_p)$  and  $\tilde{\psi} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(A_1, \dots, A_p)$  with  $\tilde{\psi}_j(x, y) = \sum_{k=1}^{q_j} [\psi_{j,k}(x) + L_1(y) + A_j L_2(y)]$  for  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ .

*Proof.* For  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , let  $\psi^k = \psi^{(8^{-k})}$  be an element in  $\tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$  such that  $\int_{B_{8^{-k}}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j^k)^2 \leq 2 \inf_{\psi' \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}} \int_{B_{8^{-k}}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \psi_j')^2$ . Applying Lemma 4.11 with  $\vartheta_2 = 1/2$ ,  $\vartheta_1 \in \{8^{-(k+1)}, 8^{-k}\}$ , and using the triangle inequality and homogeneity of  $\psi^k$ , we see that  $\int_{B_1(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(\psi_j^{k+1}, \psi_j^k)^2 \leq C 8^{-2k\mu} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2$  where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\mu = \mu(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$ . This implies that for each  $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$ ,  $(\psi_j^k)$  is a sequence of  $\mathcal{A}_{q_j}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ -valued linear functions on  $B_1(0)$  which is Cauchy with respect to the uniform metric, and hence there is  $\tilde{\psi} = (\tilde{\psi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\psi}_p) \in$

$\tilde{\mathfrak{E}}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$  such that  $\psi^k \rightarrow \tilde{\psi}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly on  $B_1(0)$ . It can now be readily checked that  $(8^{-k})^{-n-2} \int_{B_{8^{-k}}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \tilde{\psi}_j)^2 \leq C 8^{-2k\mu} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2$  for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , and hence that  $\rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{G}(w_j, \tilde{\psi}_j)^2 \leq C_1 \rho^{2\mu_1} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2$  for all  $\rho \in (0, 1/8]$ , where  $C_1 = C_1(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\mu_1 = \mu_1(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$ . Uniqueness of  $\tilde{\psi}$  is clear from this estimate. Taking  $\rho = 8^{-1}$  in the estimate and using the triangle inequality and the fact that  $\omega_n^{-1} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} |w_j|^2 \leq 1$  imply that  $\int_{B_1(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |\tilde{\psi}_j|^2 \leq \bar{C}$ , where  $\bar{C} = \bar{C}(n, m, q)$ . To see that conclusion (ii) holds, we may assume that  $\tilde{\psi} \not\equiv 0$  whence by (4.98),  $0 < c \equiv \int_{B_1(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |\tilde{\psi}_j|^2 = \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |\tilde{\psi}_j|^2 \leq 2C\rho^{2\mu} + 2\rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2$  and hence  $\rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2 > c/2$  for all sufficiently small  $\rho > 0$ . We also have, again by (4.98) and the triangle inequality that  $\rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2 \leq 2C\rho^{2\mu} \int_{B_{1/2}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2 + \bar{C} \leq 2C + \bar{C}$ . Hence if  $\rho_\ell$  is a sequence with  $\rho_\ell \rightarrow 0^+$ , then after passing to a subsequence  $c_\ell \equiv \rho_\ell^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\rho_\ell}(0)} \sum_{j=1}^p |w_j|^2 \rightarrow c_\star \in [c/2, 2C + \bar{C}]$ . Now note that  $w \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(M, A_1, \dots, A_p)$  for some  $m \times 2$  matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_p$ , so by Remark 4.4, we have that  $w^{(\ell)} \equiv \|w(\rho_\ell(\cdot))\|_{L^2(B_1(0))}^{-1} w(\rho_\ell(\cdot)) \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(CM, A_1, \dots, A_p)$  for each  $\ell$  and some fixed  $C = C(n, m, q)$ , and hence by a diagonal sequence argument, there exists  $\bar{w} \in \mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(CM, A_1, \dots, A_p)$  such that  $w^{(\ell)} \rightarrow \bar{w}$  locally in  $L^2$ . Taking  $\rho = \rho_\ell$  in (4.98), dividing both sides by  $c_\ell$  and letting  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ , we deduce that  $\tilde{\psi} = \sqrt{c_\star} \bar{w}$ . In particular,  $\bar{w}$  is a homogeneous degree 1 element of  $\mathfrak{B}_{p,\mathbf{q}}(CM, A_1, \dots, A_p)$ . Conclusion (ii), and in particular the estimate (4.100), follows from Theorem 4.8 since  $c_\star \leq 2C + \bar{C}$  (with  $C, \bar{C}$  depending only on  $n, m$  and  $q$ ).  $\square$

**4.5. Decay of fine excess of area minimizing currents.** We start with the following preliminary excess decay result.

**Lemma 4.13.** *Let  $q$  be an integer such that  $q \geq 2$ ,  $\theta \in (0, 1/4)$  and  $M \in [1, \infty)$ . There exist numbers  $\bar{\beta} = \bar{\beta}(n, m, q, M, \theta) \in (0, 1/2)$ ,  $\bar{\eta} = \bar{\eta}(n, m, q, M, \theta) \in (0, 1/2)$  and  $\bar{\delta} = \bar{\delta}(n, m, q, M, \theta) \in (0, 1/2)$  such that the following holds true: if  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  for some  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$  and  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  such that*

$$\partial T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0, \quad \omega_n^{-1} \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) < q + 1/2, \quad \Theta(T, 0) \geq q,$$

*Hypothesis ( $\star\star$ ) (of Section 3.1) and Hypothesis ( $\dagger$ ) (of Section 3.4) hold with  $\bar{\beta}, \bar{\eta}$  in place of  $\beta_0, \eta_0$  respectively, then either*

- (A)  $\mathbf{B}_{\bar{\delta}}(0, z) \cap \{Z : \Theta(T, Z) \geq q\} = \emptyset$  for some point  $(0, z) \in \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  or,
- (B) there exist an orthogonal rotation  $\Gamma$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and a cone  $\mathbf{C}'$  with  $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}$  for some  $p' \in \{2, \dots, q\}$  such that, writing

$$\hat{E}_T^2 = \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_0) d\|T\|(X) \quad \text{and} \quad E_T^2 = \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X),$$

the following hold:

- (a)  $|e_i - \Gamma(e_i)| \leq \bar{\kappa} E_T$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and  $|e_{m+j} - \Gamma(e_{m+j})| \leq \bar{\kappa} \hat{E}_T^{-1} E_T$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ;
- (b)  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C}' \cap \mathbf{B}_1, \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1) \leq \bar{C}_0 E_T$ ;
- (c)  $\theta^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma(\mathbf{B}_{\theta/2} \setminus \{r(X) \leq \theta/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\|\Gamma_{\#} \mathbf{C}'\|(X) + \theta^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\theta}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \Gamma_{\#} \mathbf{C}') d\|T\|(X) \leq \bar{\nu} \theta^{2\mu} E_T^2$ ;
- (d)  $\left( \theta^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\theta}} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\Gamma_{\#}^{-1} T\|(X) \right)^{1/2} \geq \bar{C}_1 \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1, P \cap \mathbf{B}_1) - \bar{C}_2 E_T$  for any  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  containing  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ ;

Here the constant  $\bar{C}_1 \in (0, \infty)$  depends only on  $n$  and  $m$ , and the constants  $\bar{\kappa}, \bar{\nu}, \bar{C}_0, \bar{C}_2 \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\mu \in (0, 1)$  each depends only on  $n, m$  and  $q$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $q \geq 2$ ,  $\theta \in (0, 1/2)$  and  $M \in [1, \infty)$ . For  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , let  $\eta_k, \beta_k, \delta_k \in (0, 1)$  be such that  $\eta_k \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\beta_k \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ;  $T_k$  be a locally area minimizing  $n$ -dimensional rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$ ;  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$  where  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$  and  $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_p) \in \mathfrak{M}_p$  are independent of  $k$ , such that conditions (1)-(8) of Section 4.1 hold for each  $k$ , with  $q_i$  in place of  $q_i^{(k)}$  and with  $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0^+$ , and also such that conclusion (A) of the present lemma with  $T_k$  in place of  $T$  and  $\delta_k$  in place of  $\bar{\delta}$  fails and hence condition (4.1) holds for each  $k$ . To prove the lemma, it suffices to show that for each  $k$ , there are an orthogonal rotation  $\Gamma_k$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and a cone  $\mathbf{C}'_k \in \mathcal{C}_{p', \mathbf{q}'}$  for some  $p' \in \{2, \dots, q\}$  and some  $\mathbf{q}' \in \mathfrak{M}_{p'}$ , such that after passing to an appropriate subsequences of  $(k)$ , conclusion (B) holds with  $T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{C}'_k, \Gamma_k$  in place of  $T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}', \Gamma$  respectively, and with fixed constants  $\bar{\kappa}, \bar{\nu}, \bar{C}_0, \bar{C}_2 \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\mu \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m$  and  $q$  and a fixed constant  $\bar{C}_1 \in (0, \infty)$  depending only on  $n, m$ .

By the definition of  $\mathcal{C}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$ , we have that

$$\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{j=1}^p q_j \llbracket P_j^{(k)} \rrbracket$$

where for each  $k$ ,  $P_j^{(k)} = \{A_j^{(k)} x, x, y\} : (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}\}$  for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  and for some constant  $m \times 2$  distinct matrices  $A_1^{(k)}, A_2^{(k)}, \dots, A_p^{(k)}$ . Choosing an appropriate sequence of numbers  $\tau_k$  with  $\tau_k \rightarrow 0^+$ , we obtain a fine blow-up  $w \in \mathfrak{B}_{p, \mathbf{q}}(M)$  of  $(T_k)$  relative to  $(\mathbf{C}_k)$  as described in Section 4.1. By Theorem 4.12, there is  $\tilde{\psi} = (\tilde{\psi}_1, \tilde{\psi}_2, \dots, \tilde{\psi}_p) \in \tilde{\mathfrak{L}}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$ , with  $\tilde{\psi}_j(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j} \llbracket \psi_{j, \ell}(x) + L_1(y) + A_j L_2(y) \rrbracket$  for  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  and  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , where  $\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_p) \in \mathfrak{L}_{p, \mathbf{q}}$ ,  $L_1 : \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $L_2 : \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  are (single-valued) linear functions and  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_p$  are constant  $m \times 2$  matrices, such that (4.98), (4.99) and (4.100) hold for some constants  $C, \bar{C} \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\mu \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m$  and  $q$ . Set

$$\Gamma_k = e^{E_k M_1 + E_k M_2 / \hat{E}_k}$$

where

$$\hat{E}_k^2 = \hat{E}_{T_k}^2 = \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_0) d\|T_k\|(X), \quad E_k^2 = E_{T_k}^2 = \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|T_k\|(X),$$

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & L_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -L_1^T & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -L_2 \\ 0 & L_2^T & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

representing  $L_1$  as an  $m \times (n-2)$  matrix and  $L_2$  as a  $2 \times (n-2)$  matrix. Set

$$\mathbf{C}'_k = \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j} \llbracket P_{j,\ell}^{(k)} \rrbracket$$

where  $P_{j,\ell}^{(k)} = \{(A_j^{(k)}x + E_k\psi_{j,\ell}(x), x, y) : (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}\}$ . In view of the bounds (4.99), (4.100), it readily follows that conclusions (B)(a) and B(b) hold with  $\Gamma_k$  in place of  $\Gamma$ ,  $T_k$  in place of  $T$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{C}'_k$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}'$ , and for some constants  $\bar{\kappa} = \bar{\kappa}(n, m, q)$ ,  $\bar{C}_0 = \bar{C}_0(n, m, q)$ . It follows from assertions (B), (C) of Section 4.1 and the decay estimate (4.98) that for sufficiently large  $k$ , conclusion (c) holds with  $T_k$ ,  $\mathbf{C}'_k$ ,  $\Gamma_k$  in place of  $T$ ,  $\mathbf{C}$ ,  $\Gamma$  and with appropriate constants  $\bar{\nu}$ ,  $\mu$  depending only on  $n, m, q$ . Finally, arguing exactly as in [Wic14, p. 941] (giving estimate (13.14) therein), utilising again assertion (C) of Section 4.1, we see that conclusion (d) holds with  $T_k$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k$ ,  $\Gamma_k$  in place of  $T$ ,  $\mathbf{C}$ ,  $\Gamma$ , and with appropriate constants  $\bar{C}_1 = \bar{C}_1(n, m)$  and  $\bar{C}_2 = \bar{C}_2(n, m, q)$ .  $\square$

For our purposes in the next section, where we establish for an area minimizing current  $T$ ,  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. uniqueness of tangent cones and countable  $(n-2)$  rectifiability of the set of all singularities where  $T$  does not rapidly decay to a plane, we need a version of Theorem 4.13 in which Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$  is relaxed to the following weaker assumption: the fine excess of  $T$  relative to a cone  $\mathbf{C} \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  is significantly smaller than the coarse excess of  $T$  relative to any plane  $\mathbf{P}$ , i.e. the condition  $Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq \beta \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(T, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$  for a fixed, appropriately small constant  $\beta$ . Relaxing Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$  in this manner can readily be achieved by employing Theorem 4.13 itself, provided we are content to require that conclusion (c) (the improvement of the fine excess) and conclusion (d) of Theorem 4.13 hold at one of a fixed number of (in fact  $q-1$ ) smaller scales  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{q-1}$ . For the purpose of deducing a uniform decay estimate for  $T$  by iteratively applying the lemma (as we do in the next section), allowing a fixed number of scales to choose from at each step of the iteration is just as good as single scale improvement at each stage.

**Lemma 4.14.** *Let  $q$  be an integer such that  $q \geq 2$ ,  $M \in [1, \infty)$  and let  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{q-1} \in (0, 1/4)$  be distinct numbers. There exist numbers*

$$\eta = \eta(n, m, q, M, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{q-1}) \in (0, 1/2), \quad \beta = \beta(n, m, q, M, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{q-1}) \in (0, 1/2)$$

and  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, M, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{q-1}) \in (0, 1/2)$  such that the following holds true: let  $\mathbf{C} \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  and let  $T$  be an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with

$$\partial T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0, \omega_n^{-1} \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) < q + 1/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta(T, 0) \geq q.$$

Suppose that the following two conditions hold:

(i) Hypothesis  $(\dagger)$  holds with  $\eta$  in place of  $\eta_0$ , i.e. we have that

$$E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \eta \quad \text{and} \quad E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq M \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(T, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0));$$

(ii)

$$Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \beta E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)).$$

Then either

(A)  $\mathbf{B}_\delta(0, z) \cap \{Z : \Theta(T, Z) \geq q\} = \emptyset$  for some point  $(0, z) \in \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  or,



(B) there exist an orthogonal rotation  $\Gamma$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and a cone  $\mathbf{C}' \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  such that, writing  $\hat{E}_T = E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ , the following hold:

- (a)  $|e_i - \Gamma(e_i)| \leq \kappa Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and  
 $|e_{m+j} - \Gamma(e_{m+j})| \leq \kappa \hat{E}_T^{-1} Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ;
- (b)  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C}' \cap \mathbf{B}_1, \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1) \leq C_0 Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ ;

and for some  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$ ,

- (c)  $\theta_j^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma(\mathbf{B}_{\theta_j/2} \setminus \{r(X) \leq \theta_j/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\|\Gamma_{\#} \mathbf{C}'\|(X)$   
 $+ \theta_j^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\theta_j}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \Gamma_{\#} \mathbf{C}') d\|T\|(X) \leq \nu_j \theta_j^{2\mu} Q^2(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ ;
- (d)  $\left( \theta_j^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\theta_j}} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\Gamma_{\#}^{-1} T\|(X) \right)^{1/2}$   
 $\geq C_1 \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1, P \cap \mathbf{B}_1) - C_2 Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$

for any  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  containing  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ .

Here  $\mu = \mu(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$ ;  $C_1 = C_1(n, m) \in (0, \infty)$ ; the constants  $\kappa, C_0, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$  depend only on  $n$  and  $m$  in case  $q = 2$  and only on  $n, m, q$  and  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{q-2}$  in case  $q \geq 3$ ;  $\nu_1 = \nu_1(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  and, in case  $q \geq 3$ ,  $\nu_j = \nu_j(n, m, q, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{j-1}) \in (0, \infty)$  for each  $j = 2, \dots, q-1$ . (In particular, for  $q \geq 3$ ,  $\nu_j$  is independent of  $\theta_j, \theta_{j+1}, \dots, \theta_{q-1}$  for each  $j = 2, \dots, q-1$ .)

*Proof.* We assert the following slightly more refined version of the lemma:

*Claim:* Let  $p \in \{2, \dots, q\}$  and let  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p-1} \in (0, 1/4)$ . There exist

$$\eta^{(p)} = \eta^{(p)}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-1}) \in (0, 1/2), \quad \beta^{(p)} = \beta^{(p)}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-1}) \in (0, 1/2) \quad \text{and}$$

$$\delta^{(p)} = \delta^{(p)}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-1}) \in (0, 1/2)$$

such that if  $\mathbf{C}, T$  with  $\mathbf{C} \in \cup_{p'=2}^p \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}$  satisfy the hypotheses of the lemma with  $\eta^{(p)}, \beta^{(p)}$  in place of  $\eta, \beta$ , then conclusion (A) or conclusion (B) of the lemma holds, with the following choices: in conclusion (A),  $\delta^{(p)}$  is taken in place of  $\delta$ ; in conclusion (B), the cone  $\mathbf{C}' \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ ; in conclusions (B)(a), (B)(b), constants  $\kappa^{(p)}, C_0^{(p)}$  are taken in place of  $\kappa, C_0$  and in conclusions (B)(c), (B)(d), the index  $j$  is such that  $j \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$ , the constants  $\mu, C_1$  are such that  $\mu = \mu(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $C_1 = C_1(n, m) \in (0, \infty)$  and constants  $\nu_j^{(p)}, C_2^{(p)} \in (0, \infty)$  are taken in place of  $\nu_j, C_2$ , where:  $\kappa^{(p)}, C_0^{(p)}, C_2^{(p)}$  depend only on  $n, m$  and  $q$  in case  $p = 2$  and only on  $n, m, q$  and  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p-2}$  in case  $3 \leq p \leq q$ ;  $\nu_1 = \nu_1(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  and, in case  $q \geq 3$ ,  $\nu_j^{(p)} = \nu_j^{(p)}(n, m, q, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{j-1})$  for each  $j = 2, 3, \dots, p-1$ .

It is clear that the lemma as stated follows from the claim, by simply setting  $\eta = \min\{\eta^{(p)} : p = 2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\beta = \min\{\beta^{(p)} : p = 2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\delta = \min\{\delta^{(p)} : p = 2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $\kappa = \max\{\kappa^{(p)} : p = 2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $C_0 = \max\{C_0^{(p)} : p = 2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $C_2 = \max\{C_2^{(p)} : p = 2, \dots, q\}$  and, for  $q \geq 3$  and  $j \in \{2, \dots, q-1\}$ ,  $\nu_j = \max\{\nu_j^{(p)} : p = 2, \dots, q\}$ .

To see the claim, we argue by induction on  $p$  (keeping  $q \geq 2$  fixed). First set  $\mu = \mu(n, m, q)$  to be the constant as in Lemma 4.13, and also set  $C_1 = \overline{C}_1(n, m)$  and  $\nu_1 = \overline{\nu}(n, m, q)$  where  $\overline{C}_1, \overline{\nu}$  are as in Lemma 4.13. If  $p = 2$ , the claim follows directly from Lemma 4.13 taken with  $\theta = \theta_1$ , provided we

take  $\delta^{(2)} = \bar{\delta}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1)$ ,  $\eta^{(2)} = \bar{\eta}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1)$  and  $\beta^{(2)} = \bar{\beta}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1)$ ,  $\kappa^{(2)} = \bar{\kappa}(n, m, q)$ ,  $C_0^{(2)} = \bar{C}_0(n, m, q)$ ,  $C_2^{(2)} = \bar{C}_2(n, m, q)$  where  $\bar{\delta}$ ,  $\bar{\eta}$ ,  $\bar{\beta}$ ,  $\bar{\kappa}$ ,  $\bar{C}_0$ ,  $\bar{C}_2$  are as in Lemma 4.13.

Let  $p_1 \in \{3, \dots, q\}$  and assume (the induction hypothesis) that the claim holds with  $p_1 - 1$  in place of  $p$ . We wish to show that the claim holds with  $p = p_1$ , so let  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p_1-1} \in (0, 1/4)$ . By applying the induction hypothesis (with  $\theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p_1-1}$  in place of  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p_1-2}$ ), we obtain constants  $\eta^{(p_1-1)} = \eta^{(p_1-1)}(n, m, q, M, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p_1-1})$ ,  $\beta^{(p_1-1)} = \beta^{(p_1-1)}(n, m, q, M, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p_1-1})$ ,  $\delta^{(p_1-1)} = \delta^{(p_1-1)}(n, m, q, M, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p_1-1})$ ,  $\mu = \mu(n, m, q)$ ,  $C_1 = C_1(n, m)$ ,  $\kappa^{(p_1-1)} = \kappa^{(p_1-1)}(n, m, q, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p_1-2})$ ,  $C_0^{(p_1-1)} = C_0^{(p_1-1)}(n, m, q, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p_1-2})$ ,  $C_2^{(p_1-1)} = C_2^{(p_1-1)}(n, m, q, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p_1-2})$  and  $\nu_j^{(p_1-1)} = \nu_j^{(p_1-1)}(n, m, q, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_j)$  for  $j = 2, 3, \dots, p_1 - 2$  so that the claim is true with  $p = p_1 - 1$  and with  $\theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p_1-1}$  in place of  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p_1-2}$ . We assert that the claim is true with  $p = p_1$  and with constants

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^{(p_1)} &= \min\{\eta^{(p_1-1)}, \bar{\eta}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1)\}, \quad \beta^{(p_1)} = \frac{1}{2q}(\bar{\beta}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1))^{q-1} \beta^{(p_1-1)}, \\ \delta^{(p_1)} &= \min\{\delta^{(p_1-1)}, \bar{\delta}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1)\}, \\ \kappa^{(p_1)} &= \max\left\{\frac{2\kappa^{(p_1-1)}}{\bar{\beta}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1)}, \bar{\kappa}(n, m, q)\right\}, \quad C_0^{(p_1)} = \max\left\{\bar{C} + \frac{2(C_0^{(p_1-1)} + \bar{C})}{\bar{\beta}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1)}, \bar{C}_0(n, m, q)\right\}, \\ C_2^{(p_1)} &= \max\left\{C_1\bar{C} + \frac{2(C_2^{(p_1-1)} + C_1\bar{C})}{\bar{\beta}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1)}, \bar{C}_2(n, m, q)\right\} \quad \text{and} \\ \nu_j^{(p_1)} &= \max\left\{\frac{4\nu_j^{(p_1-1)}}{\bar{\beta}^2(n, m, q, M, \theta_1)}, \bar{\nu}(n, m, q)\right\} \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, p_1 - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{\eta}$ ,  $\bar{\beta}$ ,  $\bar{\delta}$ ,  $\bar{\kappa}$ ,  $\bar{C}_0$ ,  $\bar{C}_2$  and  $\bar{\nu}$  are as in Lemma 4.13 taken with  $\theta = \theta_1$ , and  $\bar{C} = \bar{C}(n, q)$  is to be specified momentarily. To see this, let  $\mathbf{C} \in \cup_{p'=1}^{p_1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}$  and suppose that  $\mathbf{C}$ ,  $T$  are such that  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$ ,  $\partial T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0$ ,  $\omega_n^{-1} \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) < q + 1/2$ ,  $E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \eta^{(p_1)}$ ,  $E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < M \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(T, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$  and

$$Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \beta^{(p_1)} E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)).$$

If  $\mathbf{C} \in \cup_{p'=1}^{p_1-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}$ , then the conclusions of the claim are immediate by the induction hypothesis, so assume that  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p_1}$ . In this case, if additionally we have Hypothesis  $(\star\star)$  i.e. that

$$Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \bar{\beta}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1) \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \cup_{p'=1}^{p_1-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0)),$$

then we can apply Lemma 4.13 (with  $\theta = \theta_1$ ) to see that the conclusions of the claim hold again. If on the other hand

$$(4.101) \quad Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \geq \bar{\beta}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1) \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \cup_{p'=1}^{p_1-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0)),$$

then arguing as in Remark 3.8, we can find  $\bar{p} \in \{1, \dots, p_1 - 1\}$  and a cone  $\bar{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,\bar{p}}$  such that

$$(4.102) \quad Q(T, \bar{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq 2^{q-1} (\bar{\beta}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1))^{2-q} \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \cup_{p'=1}^{p_1-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0))$$

and either  $\bar{p} = 1$  or

$$(4.103) \quad \bar{p} \geq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad Q(T, \bar{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq \bar{\beta}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1) \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \cup_{p'=1}^{\bar{p}-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p'}} Q(T, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0)).$$

Note that then we must have

$$Q(T, \overline{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \beta^{(p_1-1)} E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)),$$

for otherwise, by (4.101) and (4.102), we would have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^{(p_1-1)} E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) &\leq Q(T, \overline{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \\ &\leq 2^{q-1} (\overline{\beta}(n, m, q, \theta_1))^{1-q} Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \\ &\leq 2^{q-1} (\overline{\beta}(n, m, q, M, \theta_1))^{1-q} \beta^{(p_1)} E(T, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0)), \end{aligned}$$

which is impossible in view of the definition of  $\beta^{(p_1)}$ . Thus we can apply the induction hypothesis again to deduce first that the conclusions of the claim hold (for some cone  $\mathbf{C}' \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ ) with  $\overline{\mathbf{C}}$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}$  and with the constants  $\eta^{(p_1-1)}$ ,  $\beta^{(p_1-1)}$ ,  $\delta^{(p_1-1)}$ ,  $\kappa^{(p_1-1)}$ ,  $C_0^{(p_1-1)}$ ,  $C_2^{(p_1-1)}$ ,  $\nu_j^{(p_1-1)}$  in place of  $\eta^{(p)}$ ,  $\beta^{(p)}$ ,  $\delta^{(p)}$ ,  $\kappa^{(p)}$ ,  $C_0^{(p)}$ ,  $C_2^{(p)}$ ,  $\nu_j^{(p)}$ ; consequently, in view of (4.101) and (4.102), together with the fact that

$$(4.104) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \text{spt } \overline{\mathbf{C}} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq \overline{C}(Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) + Q(T, \overline{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)))$$

where  $\overline{C} = \overline{C}(n, q)$  (which we shall justify momentarily), the claim also holds with  $p = p_1$ , and with the same cone  $\mathbf{C}'$  and with the choice of constants  $\eta^{(p_1)}$ ,  $\beta^{(p_1)}$ ,  $\delta^{(p_1)}$ ,  $\kappa^{(p_1)}$ ,  $C_0^{(p_1)}$ ,  $C_2^{(p_1)}$ ,  $\nu_j^{(p_1)}$  as defined above (taking  $\overline{C}$  in the definitions of  $C_0^{(p_1)}$ ,  $C_2^{(p_1)}$  to be the constant in (4.104)).

To see (4.104), write  $\overline{\mathbf{C}} = \sum_{i=1}^{\overline{p}} q_i \llbracket P_i \rrbracket$  for  $P_i = \{z = A_i x\}$ . Note that in view of (4.103), the current  $T$  has a “graphical representation relative to  $\overline{\mathbf{C}}$ ” in the sense of Theorem 3.11. In particular, using the notation of Theorem 3.11, there is a good set  $K$  and Lipschitz approximation  $u_i : B_{1/2}(0) \cap \{r \geq 1/8\} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{q_i}(\mathbb{R}^m)$  ( $1 \leq i \leq \overline{p}$ ) relative to  $\overline{\mathbf{C}}$ . Hence by Theorem 3.11(b),

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \cap \{r > 1/8\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \overline{\mathbf{C}}) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \cap \{r > 1/8\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \\ &\quad + C \sup_{X \in \text{spt } T \cap \mathbf{B}_{3/4}(0) \cap \{r > 1/16\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \overline{\mathbf{C}}) \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \cap \{r > 1/8\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) + CE^2(T, \overline{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \\ &\leq 2Q^2(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) + CQ^2(T, \overline{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \end{aligned}$$

and by Theorem 3.11(c),

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \cap \{r > 1/8\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|\overline{\mathbf{C}}\|(X) \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \cap \{r > 1/8\}} \sum_{i=1}^{\overline{p}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_i} \text{dist}^2((A_i x + u_{i,\ell}(x, y), x, y), \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\mathcal{L}^n(x, y) \\ &\quad + C \sum_{i=1}^{\overline{p}} \sup_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \cap \{r \geq 1/8\}} |u_i|^2 \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}) d\|T\|(X) + CE^2(T, \overline{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \\ &\leq 2Q^2(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) + CQ^2(T, \overline{\mathbf{C}}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  are constants. Since the cones  $\mathbf{C}, \overline{\mathbf{C}}$  are made up of planes, the Hausdorff distance bound as in (4.104) immediately follows.

This completes the inductive proof of the claim. The claim readily implies the lemma as already indicated.  $\square$

Lemma 4.14 is the main excess decay result that handles the “degenerate” case, i.e. the case when the current  $T$  is close to a plane (and much closer to a cone  $\mathbf{C} \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ ). We also have the following version of excess decay that is applicable to the non-degenerate case, i.e. when  $T$  lies far from any plane.

**Lemma 4.15.** *Let  $q$  be an integer such that  $q \geq 2$ ,  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ , and let  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{q-1} \in (0, 1/4)$  be distinct numbers. There exist numbers  $\beta_1 = \beta_1(n, m, q, \eta, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{q-1}) \in (0, 1/2)$ , and  $\delta_1 = \delta_1(n, m, q, \eta, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{q-1}) \in (0, 1/2)$  such that the following holds true: if  $\mathbf{C} \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ ,  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with*

$$\partial T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0, \quad \omega_n^{-1} \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) < q + 1/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta(T, 0) \geq q,$$

and if

(i) Hypothesis  $(\dagger\dagger)$  holds with  $\eta$  in place of  $\eta_0$ , i.e.

$$\inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(T, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \geq \eta, \quad \text{and}$$

(ii)

$$Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \beta_1,$$

then either

(A)  $\mathbf{B}_{\delta_1}(0, z) \cap \{Z : \Theta(T, Z) \geq q\} = \emptyset$  for some point  $(0, z) \in \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  or,

(B) there exist an orthogonal rotation  $\Gamma$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  and a cone  $\mathbf{C}' \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  such that, the following hold:

(a)  $|I - \Gamma| \leq \kappa_1 Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0));$

(b)  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C}' \cap \mathbf{B}_1, \text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1) \leq C_0^{(1)} Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0));$

and for some  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$ ,

$$(c) \quad \theta_j^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma(\mathbf{B}_{\theta_j/2} \setminus \{r(X) \leq \theta_j/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T) d\|\Gamma \# \mathbf{C}'\|(X) \\ + \theta_j^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\theta_j}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \Gamma \# \mathbf{C}') d\|T\|(X) \leq \nu_j^{(1)} \theta_j^{2\mu_1} Q^2(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)).$$

Here  $\mu_1 = \mu(n, m, q, \eta) \in (0, 1)$ ; the constants  $\kappa_1, C_0^{(1)} \in (0, \infty)$  depend only on  $n, m$  and  $\eta$  in case  $q = 2$  and only on  $n, m, q, \eta$  and  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{q-2}$  in case  $q \geq 3$ ;  $\nu_1^{(1)} = \nu_1(n, m, q, \eta) \in (0, \infty)$  and, in case  $q \geq 3$ ,  $\nu_j^{(1)} = \nu_j^{(1)}(n, m, q, \eta, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{j-1})$  for each  $j = 2, \dots, q-1$ . (In particular, for  $q \geq 3$ ,  $\nu_j^{(1)}$  is independent of  $\theta_j, \theta_{j+1}, \dots, \theta_{q-1}$  for each  $j = 2, \dots, q-1$ .)

*Proof.* It is clear that given any  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ , there is a fixed cone  $\mathbf{C}_0 = \mathbf{C}_0(\eta) \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  with  $\Theta(\mathbf{C}_0, 0) = q$  such that the following holds: for any  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , we can choose  $\beta_1 = \beta_1(n, m, q, \eta, \epsilon) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $T, \mathbf{C}$  satisfy the hypotheses of the lemma then  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_0 \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \epsilon$ . To prove Lemma 4.15, repeat the entire argument leading to Lemma 4.14 with obvious (minor) modifications; in particular, we utilise in places where that argument depended on results

of Section 3.4 the corresponding results from Section 3.5; moreover, we use  $\mathbf{C}_0$  (in place of  $\mathbf{P}_0$ ) as the parameter space for the blow-ups analysis corresponding to the blow-up analysis of Section 4, for sequences of currents  $T_k$  subject to the hypotheses of the present lemma with  $T_k$  in place of  $T$ , and with  $Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \rightarrow 0$  for a sequence of cones  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  with  $\mathbf{C}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_0$ .

More specifically, the argument involves incorporating the following changes:

- (i) We replace Theorem 3.11 (graphical representation), Corollary 3.12 (Hardt-Simon inequality), and Corollary 3.18 (excess non-concentration) with Theorem 3.4, Corollary 3.19, and Corollary 3.23.
- (ii) We replace Theorem 3.13 with Theorem 3.20. In particular, we use coordinates  $X = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+2} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  and in place of (4.9) we get that  $Z = (\xi, \zeta)$  with

$$|\xi| \leq CE_k.$$

In place of (4.11) we get

$$\int_{B_\gamma(0) \cap \{r > \tau_k\}} \frac{|u_i(x, y) - \pi_{P_i^{(k)}}^\perp \xi|^2}{|(x, y) - (\xi, \zeta)|^{n+2-\sigma}} \leq CE_k^2.$$

In place of (4.28), we get that there exists  $\lambda : B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+2}$  with  $\sup_{B_{1/4}^{n-2}(0)} |\lambda| \leq C$  and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{B}_{\rho/2}(0,z)} \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{|w_i(X) - \pi_{P_i^{(0)}}^\perp \lambda(z)|^2}{|X - (0, z)|^{n+2-\sigma}} d\|\mathbf{C}_0\|(X) \\ & \leq C\rho^{-n-2+\sigma} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(0,z)} \sum_{i=1}^p |w_i(X) - \pi_{P_i^{(0)}}^\perp \lambda(z)|^2 d\|\mathbf{C}_0\|(X), \end{aligned}$$

where  $P_i^{(0)}$  are the planes making up the reference cone  $\mathbf{C}_0$ .

- (iii) The blow-up class  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$  should now be defined as the set of  $\tilde{\psi}_j(x, y) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j} \llbracket \psi_{j,\ell}(x) + \pi_{P_i^{(0)}}^\perp(L(y), 0) \rrbracket$ , where  $L : \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+2}$  is a linear function.
- (iv) Lemma 4.5 changes in a corresponding way given item (iii), with the rotation given by  $e^{E_k M}$  where

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & L \\ -L^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence  $\tilde{P}_{j,\ell}^{(k)}$  is parameterized by

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{E_k M}((x, y) + E_k \psi_{j,\ell}(x)) \\ & = (x', y') + \pi_{P_i^{(k)}}^\perp e^{E_k M}(x, y) + E_k \psi_{j,\ell}(x) + O(E_k^2 \|\psi_{j,\ell}\| |(x, y)|) \\ & \approx (x', y') + E_k \pi_{P_i^{(k)}}^\perp(L(y'), 0) + E_k \psi_{j,\ell}(x') + O(E_k^2 (\|\psi_{j,\ell}\| + \|L\|^2) |(x, y)|) \\ & = (x', y') + E_k \tilde{\psi}_{j,\ell}(x') + O(E_k^2 (\|\psi_{j,\ell}\| + \|L\|^2) |(x, y)|) \end{aligned}$$

where  $(x', y') = \pi_{P_i^{(k)}}^\perp e^{E_k M}(x, y)$ . A similar rotation is used in the proof of Theorem 4.8 and Lemma 4.7. This rotation gives us conclusion (B)(a) of the present lemma.  $\square$

5.  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  A.E. UNIQUENESS OF TANGENT CONES AND  $(n-2)$ -RECTIFIABILITY OF THE SET OF SINGULARITIES WHERE RAPID DECAY TO A PLANE FAILS

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $q$  be an integer  $\geq 2$ . There exist  $\beta_\star, \gamma_\star \in (0, 1)$  depending only on  $n, m$  and  $q$  such that the following holds: if  $\mathbf{C} \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  and if  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$  with  $\partial T \llcorner \mathbf{B}_1(0) = 0$  such that  $\omega_n^{-1} \|T\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) < q + 1/2$ ,  $\Theta(T, 0) \geq q$  and*

$$Q(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \beta_\star \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(T, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$$

then

$$\{Z \in \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) : \Theta(T, Z) \geq q\} = \Sigma \cup \Gamma$$

where  $\Sigma \subset L$  with  $L$  a properly embedded  $(n-2)$ -dimensional  $C^{1,\mu_\star}$ -submanifold of  $\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$  with  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}(L) \leq 2\omega_{n-2} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n-2}$  and  $\Gamma \subseteq \cup_{j=1}^\infty \mathbf{B}_{\rho_j}(Y_j)$  for a countable family of balls  $\{\mathbf{B}_{\rho_j}(Y_j)\}$  with  $\rho_j < 1/2$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^\infty \rho_j^{n-2} \leq 1 - \gamma_\star$ . Here  $\mu_\star = \mu_\star(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$ . Moreover, for each  $Z \in \Sigma$ , the current  $T$  at  $Z$  has a unique tangent cone  $\mathbf{C}_Z \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  and the estimate

$$(5.1) \quad \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_Z) d\|T\| \leq C \rho^{2\mu_\star} Q^2(T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$$

holds for all  $\rho \in (0, 1/4]$  and some constant  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* Write

$$\text{sing}_q^\star T = \{Z \in \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) : \Theta(T, Z) \geq q\}.$$

Note first that for any given  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ , we can choose  $\bar{\beta}_\star = \bar{\beta}_\star(n, m, q, \beta, \varepsilon) \in (0, 1)$  such that if  $\mathbf{C}, T$  satisfy the hypotheses of the lemma with  $\bar{\beta}_\star$  in place of  $\beta_\star$ , then for any  $Z \in \text{sing}_q^\star T$ , we have that

$$(5.2) \quad \text{dist}(Z, \text{spine } \mathbf{C}) \leq \varepsilon,$$

$$(5.3) \quad Q(\eta_{Z,1/2} \# T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \beta \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(\eta_{Z,1/2} \# T, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \text{ and}$$

$$(5.4) \quad \omega_n^{-1} \|\eta_{Z,1/2} \# T\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) < q + 1/2.$$

To check this, we argue by contradiction. If the claim is false, there are sequences  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \cup_{p=1}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  and  $T_k$  such that the hypotheses of the lemma hold with  $\mathbf{C}_k, T_k, k^{-1}$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}, T, \beta_\star$  and so in particular

$$(5.5) \quad Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < k^{-1} \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(T_k, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)),$$

and yet for each  $k$  and some  $Z_k \in \text{sing}_q^\star T_k$ , either

$$(5.6) \quad \text{dist}(Z_k, \text{spine } \mathbf{C}_k) > \varepsilon \text{ or}$$

$$(5.7) \quad Q(\eta_{Z_k,1/2} \# T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \geq \beta \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(\eta_{Z_k,1/2} \# T_k, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \text{ or}$$

$$(5.8) \quad \omega_n^{-1} \|\eta_{Z_k, 1/2 \#} T_k\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) \geq q + 1/2.$$

It follows from (5.5) that for each  $k \geq 2$ ,

$$(5.9) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \text{spt } \mathbf{P} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \geq c \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(T_k, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$$

where  $c = c(n, q) > 0$ . Choose a plane  $\mathbf{P}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}$  so that  $E(T_k, \mathbf{P}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) = \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(T_k, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ . By passing to a subsequence of  $(k)$ , we obtain  $Z \in \overline{\mathbf{B}}_{1/2}(0)$  with  $Z_k \rightarrow Z$ ,  $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}$  and  $\mathbf{C} \in \cup_{p=1}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  such that, after possibly changing multiplicities and orientations of planes constituting  $\mathbf{C}_k$ , we have that  $\mathbf{P}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  as currents, and by the Federer–Fleming compactness theorem, (5.5) and the fact that  $\Theta(T_k, 0) \geq q$ , also  $T_k \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  as currents, so in particular  $\mathbf{C}$  is locally area minimizing.

Consider the cases:

- (i)  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(T_k, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) > 0$ , or
- (ii)  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(T_k, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) = 0$ .

If case (i) occurs, then by (5.9) we see that  $\mathbf{C} \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  (so  $\mathbf{C}$  is not a plane), and by upper semi-continuity of density, that  $Z \in \text{spine } \mathbf{C}$ . Thus  $\eta_{Z_k, 1/2 \#} T_k \rightarrow \eta_{Z, 1/2 \#} \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}$ , which, together with mass convergence, leads to a contradiction by letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  in (5.6), (5.7) or (5.8), whichever hold for infinitely many  $k$ .

If case (ii) occurs, assume without loss of generality (by rotating) that  $\mathbf{P}_k = \mathbf{P}_0 \equiv q[\mathbf{R}^n \times \{0\}]$  for each  $k$ , and let  $w \in W^{1,2}(B_1^n(0); \mathcal{A}_q(\mathbb{R}^m))$  be a (coarse) blow-up of a subsequence of  $(T_k)$  relative to  $\mathbf{P}_0$  (produced using Theorem 2.9, as described in [KrumWic-a, Section 5]). Let  $p_k \in \{2, \dots, q\}$  be such that  $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p_k}$ . Let  $\tau \in (0, 1/16)$  and  $\gamma \in (3/4, 1)$  be arbitrary, and let  $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n, m, q, \gamma, \tau) \in (0, 1)$  be as in Theorem 3.11. In view of (5.5), for each  $k$  we can find a cone  $\mathbf{C}'_k$  such that  $\mathbf{C}'_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,s_k}$  for some  $s_k \in \{2, \dots, p_k\}$ ,

$$(5.10) \quad Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}'_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \beta_0 \inf_{\mathbf{C}' \in \cup_{p=1}^{s_k-1} \mathcal{C}_{q,p}} Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}', \mathbf{B}_1(0))$$

and  $Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}'_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq \beta_0^{-(q-2)} Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ . Writing  $\widehat{E}_k = E(T_k, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0))$ , by (5.5) again, we then have that

$$(5.11) \quad Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}'_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq \beta_0^{-(q-2)} k^{-1} \widehat{E}_k$$

which in particular implies that

$$(5.12) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C}'_k \cap (B_1(0) \times \mathbb{R}^m), \text{spt } \mathbf{P} \cap (B_1(0) \times \mathbb{R}^m)) \geq c \widehat{E}_k$$

for any  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}$ , where  $c = c(n, q) > 0$ . The condition (5.10) allows us to apply Theorem 3.11, whence, in view of (5.11) and the fact that the blow-up  $w$  is locally Dirichlet energy minimizing, we see that  $\text{graph } w = \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_w \cap (B_1(0) \times \mathbb{R}^m)$  for some cone  $\mathbf{C}_w \in \cup_{p=1}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$ . (In particular, the possibility that  $\text{graph } w$  consists of distinct planes intersecting along an  $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace is ruled out by the energy minimizing property of  $w$ , and we have that  $\text{spine } (\mathbf{C}_w) = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-2}$ , although these facts are not needed for the rest of the argument). Moreover, given any linear function  $L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ , we can take  $\mathbf{P} = q[\text{graph } (\widehat{E}_k L)]$  in (5.12), divide both sides by  $\widehat{E}_k$  and pass to the limit as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  to see that  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } (\mathbf{C}_w) \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \text{graph } L \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \geq c$  whence  $\text{spt } \mathbf{C}_w$  is not a single plane, so that  $\mathbf{C}_w \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  for some  $p \geq 2$ . Also, by [KrumWic-a, Lemma 5.2], we have that  $w_a \equiv 0$  (where  $w_a(x)$  is the average of the  $q$  values of  $w(x)$ ). On the other hand, since  $\Theta(T_k, Z_k) \geq q$ , writing  $Z_k = (\chi_k, \xi_k, \zeta_k)$  with  $\chi_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $(\xi_k, \zeta_k) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , we see using [KrumWic-a, Theorem 5.3] that there is a point  $\zeta \in \text{spine } (\mathbf{C}_w)$  such that passing to a subsequence without changing notation,  $(\widehat{E}_k^{-1} \chi_k, \xi_k, \zeta_k) \rightarrow (w_a(0, \zeta), 0, \zeta) = (0, 0, \zeta)$ . In particular, this means

that  $\text{dist}(Z_k, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) \rightarrow 0$ , so (5.6) must fail for sufficiently large  $k$ . It is also clear by mass convergence that (5.8) must fail for sufficiently large  $k$ . So we must have (5.7) for infinitely many  $k$ .

Now, in view of (5.10), we can argue exactly as for (4.104) to see that

$$(5.13) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C}'_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq C(Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}'_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) + Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0))) \leq Ck^{-1}\widehat{E}_k.$$

This implies that  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \mathbf{P}_0 \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq C\widehat{E}_k$ , and hence

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \eta_{Z_k, 1} \# \mathbf{C}_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1^{n+1}(0), \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq C(|\chi_k|^2 + \widehat{E}_k^2 |\xi_k|^2).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|\eta_{Z_k, 1/2} \# T_k\| = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(Z_k)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z_k + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|T_k\| \\ & \leq C \left( \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k) d\|T_k\| + (|\chi_k|^2 + \widehat{E}_k^2 |\xi_k|^2) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < 1/16\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \eta_{Z_k, 1/2} \# T_k) d\|\mathbf{C}_k\| \\ & = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(Z_k) \setminus \{r(X-Z_k) < 1/32\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T_k) d\|\eta_{Z_k, 1} \# \mathbf{C}_k\| \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < 1/64\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } T_k) d\|\mathbf{C}_k\| + C(|\chi_k|^2 + \widehat{E}_k^2 |\xi_k|^2) \\ & \leq C \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{C}'_k) d\|\mathbf{C}_k\| + C(|\chi_k|^2 + \widehat{E}_k^2 |\xi_k|^2) + \\ & \quad C \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \mathbf{C}'_k \cap (\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < 1/64\}), \text{spt } \mathbf{T}_k \cap (\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < 1/64\})) \\ & \leq C \left( \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \mathbf{C}'_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)) + (|\chi_k|^2 + \widehat{E}_k^2 |\xi_k|^2) + Q(T_k, \mathbf{C}'_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = C(n, m, q)$ , and where in the last inequality we have used Theorem 3.11 (specifically, estimate (??) taken with  $\mathbf{T}_k$  in place of  $\mathbf{T}$  and  $\mathbf{C}'_k$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}$ ). Combining the above estimates with Theorem 3.13(a) we see, in view of (5.11), that

$$\widehat{E}_k^{-1} Q(\eta_{Z_k, 1/2} \# T_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \rightarrow 0$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence by (5.7),

$$(5.14) \quad \widehat{E}_k^{-1} \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(\eta_{Z_k, 1/2} \# T_k, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \rightarrow 0$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Now choosing for each  $k$  a plane  $\mathbf{Q}_k \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}$  such that

$$E(\eta_{Z_k, 1/2} \# T_k, \mathbf{Q}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) = \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(\eta_{Z_k, 1/2} \# T_k, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)),$$

we see that  $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \mathbf{Q}_k \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0), \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \leq C\widehat{E}_k$  where  $C = C(n)$ , and hence  $\text{spt } \mathbf{Q}_k = \text{graph } L_k$  where  $L_k : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is a linear function of the form  $L_k(x, y) = L_k(x, 0)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ , and there is a linear function  $L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  of the form  $L(x, y) = L(x, 0)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$



such that, after passing to a subsequence of  $(k)$ ,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{E}_k^{-1} L_k = L$ . By direct calculation, it is then not difficult to see that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{E}_k^{-2} E^2(\eta_{Z_k, 1/2 \#} T_k, \mathbf{Q}_k, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{1/2}(0, \zeta)} \mathcal{G}^2(w(x), q\llbracket L(x) \rrbracket) dx,$$

so by (5.14), we must have that  $w \equiv q\llbracket L \rrbracket$  in  $B_{1/2}(0, \zeta)$ . But this is impossible since as we have shown above,  $\text{graph } w = \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_w \cap (B_1(0) \times \mathbb{R}^m)$  with  $\mathbf{C}_w \in \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  for some  $p \geq 2$ . Thus the claim is established that there is  $\overline{\beta}_\star = \overline{\beta}_\star(n, m, q, \beta, \varepsilon)$  so that if  $T, \mathbf{C}$  satisfy the hypotheses of the theorem with  $\overline{\beta}_\star$  in place of  $\beta_\star$  then (5.2) (5.3) and (5.4) hold.

To complete the proof of the theorem choose scales  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{q-1} \in (0, 1/2)$ , depending only on  $n, m$  and  $q$ , such that  $\theta_j \geq 8\theta_{j+1}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, q-2$  and  $\nu_j \theta_j^{2\mu} < 1/2$  for  $j = 1, \dots, q-1$ , where  $\mu = \mu(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\nu_1 = \nu_1(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\nu_j = \nu_j(n, m, q, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{j-1})$ ,  $2 \leq j \leq q-1$ , are the constants as in Lemma 4.14. Let  $\eta = \eta(n, m, q, M_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{q-1})$ ,  $\beta = \beta(n, m, q, M_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{q-1})$  and  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, M_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{q-1})$  be as in Lemma 4.14 taken with  $M = M_0$ , where  $M_0 = M_0(n, m, q) \in [1, \infty)$  is to be determined. Set  $\widetilde{\beta} = \Lambda^{-1} \min\{\beta, \beta_1\}$  and  $\mu_\star = \min\{\mu, \mu_1\}$ , where  $\beta_1$  and  $\mu_1 = \mu_1$  are constants to be determined depending only on  $n, m$  and  $q$  (specified in the last paragraph of the present proof), and  $\Lambda \in [1, \infty)$  is a constant to be chosen depending only on  $n, m$  and  $q$ . Suppose that the hypotheses of the theorem hold with a choice of  $\beta_\star$  (to be fixed depending only on  $n, m, q$ ) such that  $\beta_\star \in (0, \overline{\beta}_\star(n, m, q, \widetilde{\beta}, \varepsilon))$ , where  $\overline{\beta}_\star(\cdot)$  is as established at the beginning of the proof and  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$  is to be chosen; in particular, we shall require that

$$(5.15) \quad \varepsilon < \min\{\delta^2, \Lambda^{-1}\eta\}$$

Then by (5.2), (5.3) and (5.4) we have for every  $Z \in \text{sing}_q^\star T$  that

$$(5.16) \quad \text{dist}(Z, \text{spine } \mathbf{C}) < \varepsilon,$$

$$(5.17) \quad Q(\eta_{Z, 1/2 \#} T, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \widetilde{\beta} \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(\eta_{Z, 1/2 \#} T, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \quad \text{and}$$

$$(5.18) \quad \omega_n^{-1} \|\eta_{Z, 1/2 \#} T\|(\mathbf{B}_1(0)) < q + 1/2.$$

Consider the two cases:

- (a)  $\inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E^2(T, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \Lambda^{-2}\eta^2$  or
- (b)  $\inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E^2(T, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) \geq \Lambda^{-2}\eta^2$ .

Suppose (a) holds. Then, since for any  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}$  and any  $Z \in \text{sing}_q^\star T$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} E^2(\eta_{Z, 1/2 \#} T, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) &= 2^{n+2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\| \\ &\leq 2^{n+3} \int_{\mathbf{B}_1(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \mathbf{P}) d\|T\| + \widetilde{C}^2 \text{dist}^2(Z, \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-2}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\widetilde{C} = \widetilde{C}(n, q)$ , it follows from (5.15), (5.16) and (a) that

$$(5.19) \quad \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(\eta_{Z,1/2} \# T, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < (2^{(n+3)/2} + \tilde{C}) \Lambda^{-1} \eta.$$

In view of (5.17), (5.18) and (5.19), for every  $Z \in \text{sing}_q^* T$  we can apply Lemma 4.14 with  $T_Z \equiv \Delta_Z \# \eta_{Z,1/2} \# T$  in place of  $T$  (and with  $M = M_0 = M_0(n, q) \in [1, \infty)$  specified below) where  $\Delta_Z$  is an appropriate rotation of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  that fixes  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$  and takes a plane  $\mathbf{P}_Z \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}$  attaining the infimum in (5.19) to  $\mathbf{P}_0$ . If for some  $Z \in \text{sing}_q^* T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/4}(0)$  conclusion (A) of Lemma 4.14 holds with  $T_Z$  in place of  $T$ , then  $\text{sing}_q^* T \subset \{Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : \text{dist}(Y, \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}) < \delta^2\} \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \setminus \mathbf{B}_{\delta/4}(0, y)$  for some  $y \in \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2} \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0)$ , from which it is easy to see that the conclusion of the present theorem holds with  $\Sigma = \emptyset$  and  $\Gamma = \text{sing}_q^* T$ . So we can assume that for each  $Z \in \text{sing}_q^* T$ , conclusion (B) of Lemma 4.14 holds with  $T_Z$  in place of  $T$ . Set  $\sigma_1^{(Z)} = \theta_j$  where  $\theta_j, j \in \{1, \dots, q-1\}$ , is as in conclusions (B)(c) and (B)(d) of Lemma 4.14 with  $T_Z$  in place of  $T$ . Arguing as in [MinWic22, Theorem 2.1] (which in turn uses [Wic14, Lemma 14.1]), applying Lemma 4.14 iteratively after choosing  $\Lambda = \Lambda(n, m, q)$  sufficiently large, we can now see that there is a fixed  $\beta^* = \beta^*(n, m, q) \in (0, 1/2)$  so that if the hypotheses of the present theorem hold with this choice of  $\beta^*$ , then for each  $Z \in \text{sing}_q^* T$ , either

- (i) there is an integer  $K_Z \geq 1$  together with a (finite) sequence of numbers  $\sigma_1^{(Z)}, \sigma_2^{(Z)}, \dots, \sigma_{K_Z}^{(Z)} \in (0, 1)$ , cones  $\mathbf{C}_k^{(Z)} \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  and rotations  $\Gamma_k^{(Z)}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq K_Z$ , such that conclusion (A) of Lemma 4.14 holds with  $\eta_{0, \sigma_{K_Z}^{(Z)}} \# (\Gamma_{K_Z}^{(Z)})^{-1} T_Z$  in place of  $T$ , and moreover, if  $K_Z \geq 2$  then for each  $k \in \{2, \dots, K_Z\}$ ,

(ia) conclusion (A) of Lemma 4.14 fails with  $\eta_{0, \sigma_{k-1}^{(Z)}} \# (\Gamma_{k-1}^{(Z)})^{-1} T_Z$  in place of  $T$ ;

(ib) conclusion (B) of Lemma 4.14 holds with  $\eta_{0, \sigma_{k-1}^{(Z)}} \# (\Gamma_{k-1}^{(Z)})^{-1} T_Z$  in place of  $T$ ,  $\Gamma_k^{(Z)}$  in place of  $\Gamma$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_{k-1}^{(Z)}$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_k^{(Z)}$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}'$  and with some  $\theta_k^{(Z)} \in \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{q-1}\}$  in place of  $\theta_j$  (in (B)(c) and (B)(d));

(ic)  $\sigma_k^{(Z)} = \theta_k^{(Z)} \sigma_{k-1}^{(Z)}$ ;

or,

- (ii) there are infinite sequences of numbers  $\sigma_k^{(Z)} \in (0, 1)$ , cones  $\mathbf{C}_k^{(Z)} \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  and rotations  $\Gamma_k^{(Z)}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ ,  $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , such that (ia), (ib) and (ic) above hold for each  $k$ .

The argument to reach this conclusion proceeds by induction on  $k$  exactly as in the proofs of [MinWic22, Theorem 2.1], [Wic14, Lemma 14.1], assuming by induction the validity, for indices  $1, \dots, k-1$  in place of  $k$ , of the statements directly corresponding to [Wic14, (14.2)–(14.8)], and applying in the inductive step Lemma 4.14 in place of [Wic14, Lemma 13.3]; in particular, the constant  $M_0 = M_0(n, q) \in [1, \infty)$  is chosen and fixed (cf. [Wic14, pp. 950–951]) so that, subject to the above induction hypotheses, we have

$$E^2 \left( \eta_{0, \sigma_{k-1}^{(Z)}} \# T_Z, \mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{B}_1(0) \right) \leq M_0 \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E^2 \left( \eta_{0, \sigma_{k-1}^{(Z)}} \# T_Z, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0) \right).$$

Now define, for  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ ,  $E_j = \{Z \in \text{sing}_q^* T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/4}(0) : \text{(i) above holds with } K_Z = j\}$  and define  $\Gamma = E_\infty = \{Z \in \text{sing}_q^* T \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/4}(0) : \text{(ii) above holds}\}$ . By the argument of the proof of [MinWic22, Theorem 2.1], we then obtain that  $\Gamma \subset L$  for some embedded  $C^{1,\mu}$  submanifold  $L$

of  $\mathbf{B}_{1/2}$  with  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}(L) \leq 2\omega_{n-2} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n-2}$  (in fact  $L = \text{graph } \varphi$  for some function  $\varphi : B_{1/2}^{n-2}(0) \equiv \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-2} \cap \mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{m+2}$  with  $|\varphi|_{1,\mu;B_{1/2}^{n-2}(0)} \leq C\eta$ ,  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ ); the argument moreover gives that for every  $Z \in \Sigma$ , the current  $T$  has a unique tangent cone  $\mathbf{C}_Z \in \cup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  satisfying the estimate (5.1).

To see the rest of the conclusions of the theorem (still in case (a)), i.e. to see that  $\text{sing}_q^* T \setminus \Sigma \subset \cup_j \mathbf{B}_{\rho_j}(Y_j)$  with  $\sum_j \rho_j^{n-2} < 1 - \gamma^*$  for some  $\gamma^* = \gamma^*(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$ , note that  $\text{sing}_q^* T \setminus \Sigma \subset \left(\cup_{j=1}^\infty E_j\right) \cup (\mathbf{B}_{1/2}(0) \setminus \mathbf{B}_{1/4}(0)) \cap \text{sing}_q^* T$ , and that for each  $Z \in E_j$ , by (i) above, there is a point  $Y \in Z + (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-2}) \cap \mathbf{B}_{\sigma_j/2}(0)$  such that

$$(5.20) \quad \mathbf{B}_{\delta\sigma_j/2}(Y) \cap \text{sing}_q^* T = \emptyset;$$

moreover, by (ia), (ib) and (ic), we can apply (5.16) with any point  $\in \text{sing}_q^* \eta_{0,\sigma_k^{(Z)}} \# T_Z$  in place of  $Z$  and  $\mathbf{C}_k$  in place of  $\mathbf{C}$  for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, j-1\}$  to see that

$$(5.21) \quad \text{sing}_q^* T \cap \mathbf{B}_\rho(Z) \subset \{X : \text{dist}(X, Z + \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}) < C\epsilon\rho\}$$

for each  $Z \in E_j$  and each  $\rho$  with  $\sigma_j^{(Z)} \leq \rho < 1$ , where  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$ . We can now reach the desired conclusion by choosing  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$  sufficiently small depending only on  $n, m, q$  and arguing exactly as in the last part of the proof of [Sim93, Theorem 1], with the help of the covering theorem [Sim93, Theorem 2.7] and with (5.20), (5.21) in place of [Sim93, 5.2(13)], [Sim93, 5.2(12)] respectively.

Finally, to establish the theorem in case (b), choose scales  $\theta_1^{(1)}, \dots, \theta_{q-1}^{(1)} \in (0, 1/2)$ , depending only on  $n, m$  and  $q$ , such that  $\theta_j^{(1)} \geq 8\theta_{j+1}^{(1)}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, q-2$  and  $\nu_j^{(1)}(\theta_j^{(1)})^{2\mu_1} < 1/2$  for  $j = 1, \dots, q-1$ , where  $\mu_1 = \mu_1(n, m, q, \eta) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\nu_1^{(1)} = \nu_1^{(1)}(n, m, q, \eta) \in (0, \infty)$  and  $\nu_j^{(1)} = \nu_j(n, m, q, \eta, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{j-1})$ ,  $2 \leq j \leq q-1$ , are the constants as in Lemma 4.15. Let  $\beta_1 = \beta_1(n, m, q, \eta, \theta_1^{(1)}, \dots, \theta_{q-1}^{(1)})$ ,  $\delta_1 = \delta_1(n, m, q, \eta, \theta_1^{(1)}, \dots, \theta_{q-1}^{(1)})$  be as in Lemma 4.15. Here  $\eta = \eta(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  is chosen and fixed as in case (a) discussed above. The argument for case (b) then proceeds similarly to case (a) (and is in fact closer to that of [Sim93, Theorem 1]), with Lemma 4.15 playing the role of Lemma 4.14. The proof of the theorem is thus complete.  $\square$

Combining Theorem 5.1 with [KrumWic-a, Theorem 1.1], we obtain uniqueness of tangent cones to  $n$ -dimensional area minimizing currents at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. point, and for any integer  $q \geq 2$ , rectifiability and local finiteness of measure of the set of density  $q$  singular points at which the current does not rapidly decay to a (unique) tangent plane.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $q$  be an integer  $\geq 2$ . There exists numbers  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C = C(n, m, q) \in (0, \infty)$  such that if  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current in an open subset  $U \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+m}$ ,  $Z \in U$  and  $\Theta(T, Z) = q$ , then there is a number  $\sigma_Z > 0$  (depending on  $Z$ ) such that either*

- (a) *there is an  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P_Z$ , determined uniquely by  $T$  and  $Z$ , such that the tangent cone to  $T$  at  $Z$  is equal to  $q\llbracket P_Z \rrbracket$  (with orientation induced by  $T$ ) and*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\rho(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + P_Z) d\|T\|(X) \\ \leq C \left(\frac{\rho}{\sigma}\right)^{2\alpha} \sigma^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{B}_\sigma(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + P_Z) d\|T\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\rho, \sigma$  with  $0 < \rho \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_Z$ , or,

(b) the following hold:

- (i)  $\{X : \Theta(T, X) \geq q\} \cap \mathbf{B}_{\sigma_Z}(Z)$  is countably  $(n-2)$ -rectifiable with  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}(\{X : \Theta(T, X) \geq q\} \cap \mathbf{B}_{\sigma_Z}(Z)) < \infty$ ;
- (ii) For  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. point  $Y \in \{X : \Theta(T, X) \geq q\} \cap \mathbf{B}_{\sigma_Z}(Z)$ ,  $T$  has a unique tangent cone  $\mathbf{C}_Y \in \bigcup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  (so in particular  $\Theta(T, Y) = q$ ), and there is a number  $\rho_Y > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(Y)} \text{dist}^2(X, Y + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_Y) d\|T\|(X) \\ \leq C \left(\frac{\rho}{\sigma}\right)^{2\alpha} \sigma^{-n-2} \int_{B_\sigma(Y)} \text{dist}^2(X, Y + \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_Y) d\|T\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\rho, \sigma$  with  $0 < \rho \leq \sigma \leq \rho_Y$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\beta_\star = \beta_\star(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\gamma_\star = \gamma_\star(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  be the constants as in Theorem 5.1. Let  $R = R(n, m, q, \beta_\star, \beta_\star) \in [2, \infty)$ ,  $\delta = \delta(n, m, q, \beta_\star, \beta_\star) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\eta = \eta(n, m, q, \beta_\star, \beta_\star) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\alpha = \alpha(n, m, q, \beta_\star, \beta_\star) \in (0, 1)$  be as in [KrumWic-a, Theorem 1.1] taken with  $\epsilon = \beta = \beta_\star$ . Since  $\Theta(T, Z) = q$ , there is  $\sigma_Z > 0$  such that the hypotheses of [KrumWic-a, Theorem 1.1] (taken with  $\epsilon = \beta = \beta_\star$ ) are satisfied with  $T_Z \equiv \eta_{Z, \sigma_Z} \# T$  in place of  $T$ , and hence, by the conclusion of [KrumWic-a, Theorem 1.1] we have that  $\{Y : \Theta(T_Z, Y) \geq q\} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0) = \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{S}$ , where  $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{S}$  are as in [KrumWic-a, Theorem 1.1]; in particular,  $\mathcal{B}$  is closed in  $\mathbf{B}_1(0)$ , and hence, since  $\{Y : \Theta(T_Z, Y) \geq q\}$  is closed by upper-semi continuity of density, the set  $\mathcal{S}$  is locally compact.

Since  $\Theta(T_Z, 0) = q$ , we have that either  $0 \in \mathcal{B}$  or  $0 \in \mathcal{S}$ . If  $0 \in \mathcal{B}$  then we can conclude directly from part (II) of [KrumWic-a, Theorem 1.1] that conclusion (a) of the present theorem holds. If on the other hand  $0 \in \mathcal{S}$ , then by part (I) of [KrumWic-a, Theorem 1.1] we can choose  $\rho_0 > 0$  such that  $\{Y : \Theta(T_Z, Y) \geq q\} \cap \mathbf{B}_{\rho_0}(0) = \mathcal{S} \cap \mathbf{B}_{\rho_0}(0)$ ,  $\mathcal{S} \cap \overline{\mathbf{B}_{\rho_0}(0)}$  is compact, and for every  $Y \in \mathcal{S} \cap \mathbf{B}_{\rho_0}(0)$  and every  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$ , either there is a cone  $\mathbf{C}_{Y,\rho} \in \bigcup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  such that

$$(5.22) \quad Q(\eta_{Y,\rho} \# T_Z, \mathbf{C}_{Y,\rho}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \beta_\star \inf_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{C}_{q,1}} E(\eta_{Y,\rho} \# T_Z, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B}_1(0)), \text{ or}$$

$$(5.23) \quad \{X : \Theta(\eta_{Y,\rho} \# T_Z, X) \geq q\} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0) \subset \{X : \text{dist}(X, L) \leq \beta_\star\} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0)$$

for some  $(n-3)$ -dimensional subspace  $L$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ . We can now reach conclusion (b) of the present theorem, with  $\rho_Z = \rho_0 \sigma_Z / 2$ , by arguing exactly as in the proof of [Sim93, Theorem 2'], using (5.22), (5.23) in places where that argument depends on [Sim93, Theorem 2.4], and Theorem 5.1 in places where it uses [Sim93, Theorem 1]. Specifically, if (5.22) holds true with  $Y = 0$  and  $\rho = 1$ , then we can apply Theorem 5.1 with  $\eta_{0, \rho_0} \# T_Z$  in place of  $T$  to obtain

$$(\star) \quad \{X \in \mathbf{B}_{\rho_0/2}(0) : \Theta(T_Z, X) \geq q\} \subset L \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{B}_{\rho_j}(Y_j)$$

where  $L$  is a properly embedded  $(n-2)$ -dimensional  $C^{1, \nu_\star}$ -submanifold of  $\mathbf{B}_{\rho_0/2}(0)$  for some  $\mu_\star = \mu_\star(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  and  $\{\mathbf{B}_{\rho_j}(Y_j)\}$  is a countable collection of balls with  $\rho_j < \rho_0/2$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \rho_j^{n-2} \leq (1 - \gamma_\star) \rho_0^{n-2}$ . If instead (5.23) holds true with  $Y = 0$  and  $\rho = 1$ , then by a standard covering argument  $(\star)$  holds true with  $L = \emptyset$  (see [Sim93, Theorem 2']). We know that by [KrumWic-a, Theorem 1.1], for each  $j$  either there is a cone  $\mathbf{C}_{Y_j, \rho_j} \in \bigcup_{p=2}^q \mathcal{C}_{q,p}$  such that (5.22) holds true or (5.23) holds true. (Notice that the more elementary argument of [Sim93, Lemma 2.4], which is based on the monotonicity formula for area and a compactness argument and which for its conclusions crucially relies on the assumption that the stationary varifolds considered belong to a multiplicity 1 class, gives us the weaker statement that for  $\varepsilon_\star = \varepsilon_\star(n, m, q) \in (0, 1)$  suitably

small, there is an  $n$ -dimensional area-minimizing cone  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_j$ , possibly supported on a plane, such that  $Q(\eta_{Y_j, \rho_j \#} T_Z, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_j, \mathbf{B}_1(0)) < \varepsilon_*$  and  $\{X : \Theta(\eta_{Y_j, \rho_j \#} T_Z, X) \geq q\} \cap \mathbf{B}_1(0) \subset \{X : \text{dist}(X, \text{spine } \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_j) < \varepsilon_*\}$ ; this is insufficient for continuing to apply Theorem 5.1 or the necessary covering argument.) For each  $j$  such that (5.22) holds true, we can again apply Theorem 5.1 with  $\eta_{Y_j, \rho_j \#} T_Z$  in place of  $T$ , whereas for each  $j$  such that (5.23) holds true, we can apply a standard covering argument. Iteratively applying this procedure as in [Sim93, Theorem 2'] gives us conclusion (b).  $\square$

Finally, we deduce the following result as an immediate consequence of Theorem 5.2.

**Corollary 5.3.** *If  $T$  is an  $n$ -dimensional locally area minimizing rectifiable current in an open set  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ , then for  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}$  a.e. point  $Z \in \text{spt} T$ , the current  $T$  has a unique tangent cone  $\mathbf{C}_Z$  of the form  $\mathbf{C}_Z = \sum_{j=1}^p q_j \llbracket P_j \rrbracket$  where  $p, q_1, \dots, q_p$  are integers  $\geq 1$ , and  $P_1, \dots, P_p$  are distinct  $n$ -dimensional planes such that if  $p \geq 2$  (i.e. if  $\mathbf{C}_Z$  is not supported on a single plane) then there is an  $(n-2)$ -dimensional subspace  $L$  with  $P_i \cap P_j = L$  for every  $i \neq j$ . Furthermore, we have that*

$$\text{sing } T = \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{S}$$

where:

(i)  $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{S} = \emptyset$ ;

(ii)  $\mathcal{S}$  is countably  $(n-2)$ -rectifiable and

(iii) every point  $Z \in \mathcal{B}$  is a branch point of  $T$  where  $T$  has a unique tangent cone supported on an  $n$ -dimensional plane  $P_Z$ ; moreover, for every compact set  $K \subset U$  and every  $Z \in \mathcal{B} \cap K$ , the current  $T$  “decays rapidly” to  $P_Z$  in the sense that there are numbers  $\alpha_K = \alpha(K, T) \in (0, 1)$  and  $C_K = C(K, T) \in (0, \infty)$  such that the estimate in Theorem 5.2(a), with  $\alpha = \alpha_K$  and  $C = C_K$ , holds for some  $\sigma_Z > 0$  (depending on  $Z$ ) and all  $\rho, \sigma$  with  $0 < \rho \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_Z$ .

*Proof.* The set  $E$  of singular points of  $T$  where there is no tangent cone of the form  $\sum_{j=1}^p m_j \llbracket P_j \rrbracket$  for some integer  $p \geq 1$ , positive integers  $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_p$  and distinct  $n$ -dimensional planes  $P_1, \dots, P_p$ , has Hausdorff dimension  $\leq n-3$ . For each compact subset  $K \subset U$ , the set  $\{\Theta(T, Z) : Z \in K\}$  is bounded, and hence there is a finite set  $\{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_N\}$  of integers  $\geq 2$ , where  $N = N(T, K)$ , such that  $\{\Theta(T, Z) : Z \in \text{sing } T \cap K \setminus E\} = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_N\}$ . Set  $\alpha_K = \min\{\alpha(n, m, q_j) : j = 1, \dots, N\}$ ,  $C_K = \max\{C(n, m, q_j) : j = 1, \dots, N\}$  where  $\alpha(n, m, q)$ ,  $C(n, m, q)$  are as in Theorem 5.2(a), and set  $\mathcal{B}_K$  be the set of points  $Z \in \text{sing } T \cap K$  such that the estimate of Theorem 5.2(a) holds with  $\alpha = \alpha_K$  and  $C = C_K$  for some  $\sigma_Z > 0$ . Setting  $\mathcal{B} = \cup_K \mathcal{B}_K$  where the union is over all compact  $K \subset U$ , and  $\mathcal{S} = \text{sing } T \setminus \mathcal{B}$ , the assertions of the present theorem can be verified with the help of Theorem 5.2.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [All72] Allard, William K. *On the first variation of a varifold*. Ann. of Math. 95.3 (1972): 417–491.
- [Alm83] Almgren Jr., Frederick J. *Almgren’s big regularity paper:  $Q$ -valued functions minimizing Dirichlet’s integral and the regularity of area minimizing rectifiable currents up to codimension two*. World Scientific Monograph Series in Mathematics. 1 World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc., River Edge, NJ (2000).
- [Cha88] Chang, Sheldon Xu-dong. *Two dimensional area minimizing integral currents are classical minimal surfaces*. Jour. Amer. Math. Soc. 1(4), (1988): 699–778.
- [DelSpa11] De Lellis, Camillo and Spadaro, Emanuele Nunzio. *Almgren’s  $Q$ -valued functions revisited*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 211 (2011) no. 991, vi+79 pp.
- [DelSpa14] De Lellis, Camillo and Spadaro, Emanuele Nunzio. *Regularity of area minimizing currents I: gradient  $L^p$  estimates*. GAFA 24.6 (2014): 1831–1884.
- [DelSpa16-I] De Lellis, Camillo and Spadaro, Emanuele Nunzio. *Regularity of area minimizing currents II: center manifold*. Ann. of Math. (2016): 499–575.

- [DelSpa16-II] De Lellis, Camillo and Spadaro, Emanuele Nunzio. *Regularity of area minimizing currents III: blow-up*. Ann. of Math. (2016): 577–617.
- [Fed69] Federer, H. *Geometric measure theory*. Springer, 2014.
- [HarSim79] Hardt, Robert and Simon, Leon. *Boundary regularity and embedded solutions for the oriented Plateau problem*. Annals of Math. **110** (1979): 439–486.
- [KrumWic-a] Krummel, Brian and Wickramasekera, Neshan. *Analysis of singularities of area minimising currents: intrinsic frequency, branch points with rapid decay, and weak locally uniform approximation*. preprint.
- [KrumWic-c] Krummel, Brian and Wickramasekera, Neshan. *Analysis of singularities of area minimising currents: higher order decay estimates at branch points and rectifiability of the singular set*. manuscript in preparation.
- [KrumWic21] Krummel, Brian and Wickramasekera, Neshan. *Fine properties of branch point singularities: stationary graphs and stable minimal hypersurfaces near points of density  $< 3$* . arXiv:2111.12246v1 (2021).
- [KrumWic17] Krummel, Brian and Wickramasekera, Neshan. *Fine properties of branch point singularities: Dirichlet energy minimizing multi-valued functions*. arXiv:1711.06222 (2017).
- [MicWhi95] Micallef, Mario J. and White, Brian. *The structure of branch points in minimal surfaces and in pseudoholomorphic curves*. Ann. of Math. 141.1 (1995), 35–85.
- [MinWic22] Minter, Paul and Wickramasekera, Neshan. *A structure theory for stable codimension 1 integral varifolds with applications to area minimising hypersurfaces mod  $p$* . arXiv:2111.11202 (2022).
- [Sim83] Simon, Leon. (1983). *Lecture Notes on Geometric Measure Theory*. Proceedings of the Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Australian National University, 3.
- [Sim93] Simon, Leon. *Cylindrical tangent cones and the singular set of minimal submanifolds*. J. Diff. Geo. (1993) 38:585–652.
- [Whi83] White, Brian. *Tangent cones to 2-dimensional area-minimizing integral currents are unique*. Duke Math. J. **50** (1983), 143–160.
- [Wic04] Wickramasekera, Neshan. *A rigidity theorem for stable minimal hypercones*. J. Diff. Geo. 68(3) (2004): 433–514.
- [Wic14] Wickramasekera, Neshan. *A general regularity theory for stable codimension 1 integral varifolds*. Ann. of Math. (2014): 843–1007.

Brian Krummel  
 School of Mathematics & Statistics  
 University of Melbourne  
 Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia  
 brian.krummel@unimelb.edu.au

Neshan Wickramasekera  
 DPMMS  
 University of Cambridge  
 Cambridge CB3 0WB, United Kingdom  
 N.Wickramasekera@dpms.cam.ac.uk